

The Solicitors' Journal.

LONDON, JUNE 21, 1862.

AT A MEETING of the Managing Committee of the Metropolitan and Provincial Law Association, held on the 13th inst., at which Mr. W. Sharn, M.A., presided, the following resolutions were moved by Mr. J. S. Torr and seconded by Mr. S. Williams:—

1. That as the proceedings on inquests partake of a judicial character, and frequently involve technical and difficult questions as to the admissibility of evidence; and as the coroner has not unfrequently to determine points of law between contending counsel, and has always to sum up the evidence and to explain to the jury the law which bears upon the case, it is important that the office of coroner should be filled by a member of the legal profession.

2. That the ensuing elections for the two vacant districts of the county of Middlesex afford favourable opportunities for the profession practically to express their views upon this subject.

The resolutions were unanimously adopted.

THE MIDDLESEX MAGISTRATES have assigned the eastern division of the county to Mr. Humphreys, and decided the question as to the coroner of the Duchy of Lancaster. The writ *De Coronatore eligendo* will therefore be forthwith issued from the Crown Office in Chancery for the election of two coroners for the divisions of the central and western parts of the county. The sheriff, on the receipt of the writ, will fix the day of election, which, by the Act 7 & 8 Vict. c. 92, cannot take place less than seven days nor more than fourteen after the receipt of the writ. The nomination for the central division will take place at Marylebone, and for the western division at Brentford. The ninth clause of the Act 7 & 8 Vict. c. 92, provides "that from and after the time when any county shall have been so as aforesaid divided, every election of a coroner for any such districts shall be held at some place within the district in which he shall be elected to serve the office of coroner; and that every person to be so elected shall be chosen by a majority of such persons residing within such district as shall at the time of such election be duly qualified to vote at the elections of coroners for the said county." The expenses of the sheriff are to be paid by the candidates in equal proportions. By a recent Act (23 & 24 Vict. c. 116) the polling is confined to one day. The salary of the late coroner was fixed at £1,800, including his expenses, and the Middlesex magistrates will have to determine the sums to be paid to the new coroners, with an appeal to the Home Secretary on either side.

Just as this journal was going to press on Friday evening last we received, but too late for insertion, a report of a meeting of the managing committee of the Metropolitan and Provincial Law Association, which had been convened for the purpose of considering the question involved in the pending contest for the two vacant coronerships of Middlesex. We feel bound in justice to that large and influential body to state this fact, as we expressed our surprise last week that none of the law societies, either in the metropolis or the provinces, had exhibited any interest in a question which is certainly one of great importance to the profession. Although country solicitors are not so immediately interested in the Middlesex contests as their metropolitan brethren, there can be no doubt whatever that the result of the Middlesex elections will have a very direct and powerful influence upon all the constituencies of freeholders throughout the country, as vacancies arise in the office of coroner. The question has now been distinctly raised between the legal and medical professions as to which can supply *ceteris*

paribus, the most competent candidates; and it cannot be supposed that whatever decision the metropolitan county may arrive at after a full discussion of the matter will not be an all but conclusive precedent for less important constituencies. If a doctor is elected for Middlesex because of his "knowledge of the laws of life, disease, and death" and in spite of his ignorance of the laws of evidence and judicial business, no doubt the same reasons, when backed up by precedent and authority, will not have less force in provincial counties. The point at issue is, therefore, not less important to country than to London lawyers, and it is one on which country law societies would do well to lose no time in pronouncing their opinion. We hear that Dr. Lankester is appealing not only for moral but even for pecuniary support to members of the medical profession generally, on the ground that he is fighting a battle for the whole body of doctors and surgeons. We have not heard that either Mr. C. E. Lewis, Mr. Cameron, Mr. Bird, or any other lawyers who are in the field as candidates, either for the central or the western district, have made any such appeal to their professional brethren, nor do we suppose it is likely they will do so. But certainly solicitors owe it to themselves as a body to rally round their own candidates, who are fighting a battle quite as hard on their side without the extraneous aids of a wide professional organization and of pecuniary contributions. Another reason why our profession should back up its own candidates is that the question now raised is one as to which the interests of the lawyers coincide with those of the public, and the only argument in favour of the doctors is based upon a fallacy that becomes transparent upon the slightest scrutiny. In nine cases out of ten that come before a coroner there is no question whatever as to the physical cause of death; and whenever such a question arises it is anything but an advantage to have the medical testimony from the lips of a coroner rather than from medical witnesses. On the other hand in a large proportion of cases important questions arise as to the legal cause of death. It is very often the duty of the coroner and jury to inquire by whose default or negligence the deceased came by his death, and it would not be easy to suggest any inquiry requiring in the person who conducted it greater acquaintance with the principles of our law and rules of evidence, or a greater experience in judicial business. The matter is so plain that it only needs to be brought before the public to meet general acceptance. At the same time it is quite possible that the combined efforts of the medical profession, aided by the unpopularity of lawyers and opposed by nothing except individual organization, may succeed in bringing about a result which would be detrimental to the interests of the public, equally with those of the lawyers.

THE QUEEN has been pleased to direct letters patent to be passed under the Great Seal granting the dignity of a Knight of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland unto John Mellor, Esq., one of the justices of her Majesty's Court of Queen's Bench.

THE QUEEN has been pleased to nominate and appoint the Honourable Charles Baillie, one of the Lords of Session, to be one of the Lords of Justiciary in Scotland, in the room of James Ivory, Esq., resigned.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR has appointed Mr. H. R. Vaughan Johnson, of the Equity Bar, one of the conveyancing counsel to the Court of Chancery, in the room of Mr. Christie, who has resigned. Mr. Vaughan Johnson was sometime, as many of our readers are aware, principal Secretary to Lord Chancellor Campbell, and has been for several years one of the learned reporters of Vice-Chancellor Wood's Court.

MR. J. K. JOLLY has been appointed a member of the Legislative Council and justice of the peace for the island of Ceylon. Mr. R. F. Morgan has been appointed Acting

Deputy Queen's Advocate, during the absence of Mr. C. H. Stewart. Mr. George Lawson has been appointed acting district judge of Colombo. Mr. Thomas Berwick has been appointed Acting Deputy Queen's Advocate for the Midland Circuit. Mr. F. Neil has been appointed Acting Deputy Queen's Advocate for the Southern Circuit. Mr. A. Y. Adams has been appointed district judge, commissioner of requests, and police magistrate of Badulla, vice Dr. Clarke, resigned. Mr. H. S. O. Russell has been appointed district judge, commissioner of requests, and police magistrate of Negombo, vice Mr. L. Jumeaux, deceased. Mr. W. C. Macready has been appointed district judge, commissioner of the Court of Requests, and police magistrate of Chilaw, vice Mr. Russell. Mr. John Selby has been appointed acting district judge, acting commissioner of the Court of Requests, and acting police magistrate of Negombo, in the room of Mr. Russell, who will continue, until further orders, to act as assistant, at Badulla, to the Government agent for the central province.

AMONGST THOSE upon whom the degree of Honorary Doctors of Law were conferred at Cambridge University last week were Lord Brougham, Sir Hugh McCalmont Cairns, Q.C., and Mr. Charles James Selwyn, Q.C.

THE EQUITY COURTS will sit on Tuesday next.

THE COURT OF EXCHEQUER will sit at Nisi Prius in Middlesex, this day, and on Monday, June 23, Tuesday, 24, Wednesday, 25, Thursday, 26, Friday, 27, and Saturday, 28, and take special and common jury causes. The Court will sit in London on Monday, June 30, Tuesday, July 1, Wednesday, 2, Thursday, 3, Friday, 4, Saturday, 5, Monday, 7, Tuesday, 8, Wednesday, 9, Thursday 10, Friday, 11, Saturday, 12, Monday, 14, and Tuesday, 15, and take special and common jury causes. Should it be necessary, a second Court will sit for the trial of causes.

THE LAND TRANSFER BILLS.

It seems to be by no means improbable that the House of Commons will pass the Lord Chancellor's Land Transfer Bill in some shape or other this session, although it would be impossible to obtain the attendance of a sufficient number of members but for the services of the Government whippers-in. Parliament seems disposed to take no trouble whatever in the matter, and listens with the utmost impatience to those among its legal members who are willing to discuss it. The extent of ignorance prevailing, both in the House of Commons and outside it, about the provisions of the several bills relating to the transfer of land which have recently been sent down by the House of Lords, is well nigh incredible; and as the matter now stands we are likely to have, as the result of them all, just such a measure as it may please the Solicitor-General to give us, and no other. The Government considers it must do something, and it therefore "makes a house" to pass the Lord Chancellor's bill, with such modifications only as Sir Roundell Palmer chooses to allow. The morning journals have got up a parrot-cry in favour of Lord Westbury's scheme, and if it should be enacted it will, no doubt, be hailed as a great "law amendment," although even the leading journalists exhibit a marvellous unacquaintance with the whole matter. The *Times* of Tuesday last, in an article intended to be very racy and piquant, says that "a man who had obtained a registered title under the Lord Chancellor's Act would scarcely desire to petition the Court of Chancery for a declaration of title by the Court of Chancery under the Declaration of Title Act, or require an endorsement upon his grantor's title deeds under the third Act." The writer evidently supposes that there is to be no such preliminary investigation of title under the Lord Chancellor's registration scheme as there would be under Lord Cranworth's scheme, whereas, in fact, the main features of both schemes are, in this respect, almost identical. The Court

of Chancery, according to either, would have to "declare" the title. The Lord Chancellor does not propose that any other tribunal should resolve the doubts or remove the difficulties arising in the investigation of title. There is, in fact, no substantial difference between the two plans as to the mode provided for the attainment of the "declaration," except that the Lord Chancellor starts by creating a set of new and expensive officers, whose services may not be necessary for the attainment of the proposed end. We are told, however, in the article from which we have quoted, and which goes on to contrast the two schemes, that "one provides a registration of titles after a business-like official investigation, such as is now held in the chambers of skilled lawyers; and the other provides for an infinite succession of Chancery suits, with all the expensive accessories of wigs and gowns, and courts and counsel, and long arguments, interminable adjournments, and immeasurable bills of costs. The first bill states its object to be 'to give certainty to the titles to real estates, and to render the dealing with land more simple and economical,' and it gives some promise of contributing towards its declared object; the second only brings the Court of Chancery into every man's muniment-room, and domesticates a Chancery suit in every squire's hall."

Any person who has taken the trouble to read the bills in question will be surprised at this account of them. The writer mixes up together the registration of the title when it is declared and the mode of obtaining such declaration, and he contrasts the thing itself when obtained and ready for registration, with the trouble and expense of obtaining it. He gives to Lord Westbury all the praise of the result, and to Lord Cranworth all the odium of the process, the colouring being laid on thick in each case to suit the purpose of the writer. It is not necessary, however, to inform our readers that the infinite "successions of Chancery suits" are much more likely to proceed from Lord Westbury's than from Lord Cranworth's measure. According to the former "every question, doubt, or dispute" is to be referred to a judge in Chancery at the option of the new registrar; but Lord Cranworth, recognizing the fact that the judge will have ultimately to decide whether or not the title is to be declared indefeasible, places the whole matter before him originally upon a petition setting forth the applicant's title, similar to what is now used under the Leases and Sales of Settled Estates' Act. Practically, however, there is little difference between both schemes so far as they aim at providing machinery for the attainment of indefeasibility, so that all that the *Times* has been saying in favour of the one and in depreciation of the other, proceeds from mere ignorance or something worse, at least so far as the first and most important part of both schemes are concerned. A different question arises when once the declaration of the Court has been obtained, and upon this the relative merits of the two schemes are more open to discussion. Lord Westbury proposes that the State shall keep a record of all subsequent transactions with the land, and for this purpose provides a registrar whose duty it will be to define and record what these transactions are. Lord Cranworth, on the other hand, conceives that the State has got nothing to do with the matter, and that it had far better be left to the care of those whose interests are concerned. But he would provide very simple machinery, costing the parties little, and the general taxpayer nothing, for enabling a record of the subsequent transactions to be made upon the certificate of title when granted by the Court. We believe that sound political economy, as well as considerations of expense, and convenience, are in favour of Lord Cranworth's plan. At all events its trial involves no risk, and no alteration either in the constitution of our court, or the rules of the law of real property, while the Lord Chancellor's project, if unsuccessful in its operation, will not only in-

volve the the country in a large and useless expenditure, but will work infinite disturbance in the title of real estates in this country.

IRISH JUDGMENTS.

Prior to the passing of the Act 13 & 14 Vict. c. 29 (the Judgment Mortgage Act, Ireland), the law of Irish judgments substantially stood on the same footing as that of judgments in England. The Act referred to placed judgments in Ireland on a wholly different and peculiar footing as regards real estate. The first section of this Act repealed the statutes 5 & 6 Will. 4, c. 53, 3 & 4 Vict. c. 105, 7 & 8 Vict. c. 90, 11 & 12 Vict. c. 120, and 12 & 13 Vict. c. 95. As regards all future Irish judgments entered up after the 15th July, 1850, this Act is, by its 2nd section, endowed with a retrospective operation in respect of land purchased by a conuzor after the date before mentioned. The old law, therefore, remains intact only so far as the real estate possessed by the conuzor before the passing of the Judgment Mortgage Act is concerned. Wherever either (1) the judgment has been entered up, or (2) the purchase has been made subsequent to the passing of the Act it alone applies. Realty acquired by the conuzor either by will or voluntary gift at any date comes under the old law. "A purchaser for valuable consideration" is a favoured exception. Such a description, of course, suits only a *bona fide* purchaser as distinguished from a volunteer, and not as contrasted with a person entitled by descent. The 3rd, 4th, & 5th sections apply to the registration of judgments, and *lites pendentes*, and make no material change in the previously existing law.

The gist of the Act is contained in the 6th section. By it a creditor under a judgment entered up after the 15th July, 1850, may make an affidavit that the conuzor of such judgment is the owner of lands (if the fact be so), which are to be described as directed by the Act, and may file such affidavit in the office for registering deeds in Ireland. By the next section the effect of a mortgage is given to such affidavit in respect of the land therein specified. The concluding sections of the Act preserve to the judgment creditor his right to issue a *fiat facias* and his old priority in the administration of assets.

This statute had a novelty of principle and great merit in its relations to registration. If portions could be charged at law, or if all charges on land could be reduced to a single denomination, it is obvious that much complexity would be removed from our feudal jurisprudence. Unhappily, however, bold expedients, unless organised with care, seldom eventuate successfully. And so it was, we believe, with the Irish Judgment Mortgage Act. Framed as it was, it led to various questions that could not be solved, except upon mere conjecture not guided by any reference, however remote, to principle. Was the legal estate of the owner in fee of land of the value of £10,000 a-year transferred to his judgment-mortgagee, whose debt was only £100, so as to incapacitate the mortgagor from bringing an ejectment, except where the tenant was estopped from disputing the mortgagor's right to recover? Was a reconveyance necessary, upon payment of the debt, in order to revert the legal estate in the conuzor? Was the mortgagee a purchaser, or merely a creditor with certain special powers? In short, was a judgment mortgagee a mortgagee to all intents and purposes, or merely for the objects of the Act? These were questions readily suggested by the Act, but not admitting of an easy solution. The merits of this statute, however, in respect of registration were unquestionable. In Ireland there is a general registry system, according to which every deed takes its priority, not from its date, but from the date of its registration. A search of the registry accordingly precedes every sale or mortgage of land in Ireland. The Judgment Mortgage Act, which was

prepared by Mr. Hatchell, was intended to save intending purchasers or mortgagees the trouble and expense of a search, both in the office for registering deeds and also in the offices for registering judgments. When discussing the merits of the principle of that Act we should bear in mind whether we are considering its relations to a country having a system of registration, or one that has a legal system such as is our own at present. If the bills now before Parliament become law, we are strongly inclined to think that we could adopt, with every likelihood of advantage, the principle of the Judgment Mortgage Act, taking care to secure, by proper provisos freedom from the perils which the Irish Act encountered. Such an act would be, in effect, the validating at law of charges on land. A concise method of incumbering land is a natural corollary to a system of Parliamentary titles.

We gave, *ante*, vol. 5, p. 745, an outline of Mr. Longfield's debenture scheme, which was doubtless regarded by its learned originator as a supplementary desideratum to the legal system which he has now for fourteen years administered. There may, perhaps, be no insuperable difficulty in the way of incumbering land by a debenture or by a short statutory form of judgment or of mortgage. Some such device we may expect will soon follow the enactment of the transfer of land measures now before Parliament, whatever time that event may take place. We have, therefore, considered an examination of the mode of incumbering land in Ireland not out of place at the present time when we are engaged in discussing a principle of transfer which is recommended to our adoption mainly by its alleged success in the sister country.

The Irish Judgment Bill, now before Parliament, is an attempt to assimilate the Irish law to that of England, as regulated by sects. 1 and 2 of the 23 & 24 Vict. c. 38. The bill repeals all the preceding statutes affecting the powers of judgment creditors over the lands of their debtors. It then re-enacts the 19th and 22nd sections of the Act 3 & 4 Vict. c. 105, and empowers a creditor by judgment to sell in the Landed Estates Court. The bill then contains clauses in favour of purchasers similar to the provisions concerning the same favoured class contained in Lord St. Leonards' Act. Against these no judgment is to have any effect, unless and until it shall have been registered, and unless writs of execution shall have been issued thereon, and likewise registered. There is a section also enjoining registration in order to secure a judgment creditor his priority in the administration of assets. The bill has been prepared by Mr. Whiteside, to whom Ireland is indebted for the extension of the reforms in common law procedure adopted by us some fourteen years ago. Although so eminent as an advocate, we are not sure that the learned and eloquent gentleman is the best authority on points in conveyancing. We are somewhat unwilling to see the Judgment Mortgage Act wholly uprooted until an equally concise system of incumbering land either by debenture or otherwise shall have been offered as a substitute. Neither can we very highly appreciate an Act that aims at securing purchasers only by an expensive and complicated series of registrations, the omission of any one of which may be fatal to a judgment creditor. We think that the Judgment Mortgage Act ought to be amended, and not wholly repealed.

THE FRAUDULENT TRUSTEE ACT.

The object of this enactment, as borne out by its heading, is to make "better provision for the punishment of frauds committed by trustees, bankers, and other persons intrusted with property." The Act itself, as our readers are aware, has been since repealed, and re-enacted with some slight additions by the Criminal Law Consolidation Act, 24 & 25 Vict. c. 96.

We propose here to inquire what is intended by the

meaning of the words "*fraudulent conversion by bailees*," as used in the 3rd section of the 24 & 25 Vict. c. 96, which enacts as follows:—"Whosoever being a bailee of any chattel, money, or valuable security, shall fraudulently take or convert the same to his own use, or the use of any person other than the owner thereof, although he shall not break bulk or otherwise determine the bailment, shall be guilty of larceny." This section was obviously intended to amend a defect in the law of larceny—namely, to render a fraudulent conversion by a bailee, without breaking bulk or otherwise determining his bailment, a larceny; formerly it was necessary that the bailee should either break bulk, or determine his bailment to constitute a "*taking*" one of the essential attributes of larceny. This section therefore does away with the distinction laid down by Lord Hale, "that if a man delivers goods to a carrier to carry to Dover, and he carries them away, it is no felony, but if he have a bale or trunk with goods in it delivered to him, and he breaks the bale or trunk, and carries away the goods *animus furandi*, it is a felonious taking: 1 Hale P. C. 504."

A doubt has also been raised, how is the expression "convert to his own use or the use of any other person other than the owner thereof," as there used to be interpreted? Does it in fact mean a temporary as well as a permanent conversion? for if so it would clearly very much extend and widen the scope of the Act. We cannot but think that it must mean such a conversion as would be necessary to constitute a larceny, and we find the definition of larceny to be "the wrongful or fraudulent taking or carrying away the goods of another, with a felonious intent to convert them to his (the taker's) own use, and make them his property," the "fraudulent taking" being explained to be a taking without any colour of right, and the "felonious" intent, an intent to deprive the owner *permanently* of his property: *Reg. v. Holloway*, 2 C. & K. 242. Whatever may have been the intention of the framers of the Act, the Courts have invariably put such a construction upon the above section as would seem clearly to show that they had no intention of extending the meaning of the words there used beyond their literal signification. We refer to the decisions that have occurred upon the word "*bailee*," in which it has been repeatedly held by the Courts that the bailment intended was a deposit of something which *was in itself* to be returned; and therefore that a person with whom money had been deposited, and who was under an obligation to return the amount, but not the identical coin deposited, was not such a bailee as was contemplated by that section.

We find from the interpretation clause that the word "property" is intended to include "every description of real and personal property, money, debts, and legacies," as well as "not only such property as shall have been originally in the possession or under the control of any party," but also any property into or for which the same may have been converted or exchanged, and anything acquired by such conversion or exchange, whether immediately or otherwise; so that naturally we might have expected to find that a fraudulent conversion by the treasurer of a money-club, whose duty it was to receive sums of money, but not to return the same in specie, would have been held to be a *bailment* within the purview of the Act. It was decided in *Reg. v. Hassall*, 9 W. R. 708, otherwise, on the ground that there was no obligation on the part of the treasurer to return the identical coin. In conclusion we cannot do better than make the following quotation from the note to Mr. Greave's Edition of the Criminal Statutes, p. 73, "The object of this clause was simply to make those cases larceny, where the general property in the thing delivered was never intended to be parted with at all, but only the possession; where, in fact, an owner delivered the property to another under such circumstances as to deprive himself of the possession for some time, whether

certain or uncertain, and whether longer or shorter, at the expiration or determination of which time the owner was to have restored to him the very same thing that had been so delivered. In order, therefore, to bring a case within this clause, in addition to the fraudulent disposal of the property, it must be proved—1st, that there was such a delivering of the property as to divest the owner of the possession, and vest it in the prisoner for some time; 2ndly, that at the expiration or determination of that time the identical same property was to be restored to the owner."

The Courts.

COURT OF CHANCERY. (Before the LORDS JUSTICES.)

June 13.—*In Lunacy.—In re Smith*.—Their Lordships directed an inquiry in this case into the state of mind of the alleged lunatic, Lord Justice Knight Bruce observing that it was a mistaken idea entertained by many that the finding by a jury that a person was of unsound mind necessarily involved an interference with his personal freedom. The Court placed no further restraint upon a lunatic than was necessary for his protection, and several lunatics who were under the protection of the Court were now residing with large establishments in their own houses.

COURT OF QUEEN'S BENCH.

(Sittings in Banco, before Lord Chief Justice COCKBURN, and Justices WIGHTMAN, CROMPTON, and BLACKBURN.)

June 17.—*In re H. A. De Medina*.—Mr. Gray showed cause against a rule obtained at the instance of the Incorporated Law Society, calling upon Mr. De Medina to show cause why he should not be suspended for three years from practising as an attorney of this court. Mr. De Medina had been suspended from practising for three years in the Court of Exchequer, and fined £100 for contempt of that court. The learned counsel contended that the Court had no power to suspend Mr. De Medina from practising in this court for misconduct in the Court of Exchequer.

The LORD CHIEF JUSTICE said if that were so the practical effect of the suspension would be no punishment at all. He would still be able to practise by bringing all his actions in this court.

Mr. Gray submitted there was a difference between striking an attorney off the rolls and suspending him from practising in the Court of Exchequer. There was a precedent in favour of the defendant. The Attorneys Act only provided for striking an attorney off the rolls, and not for suspension.

Mr. Garth, on the part of the Incorporated Law Society, said the defendant was charged with drawing up an imaginary order and affixing the judge's name to it, without his knowledge or consent.

Mr. Gray said the defendant satisfactorily explained it in his affidavit. No doubt it was an improper thing for an attorney to do. He urged that the Court had no materials to proceed upon.

The LORD CHIEF JUSTICE said that the suspension of an attorney was *prima facie* evidence of malpractice for this Court to act on.

Mr. Garth said that rules had been obtained in the Common Pleas and in Chancery, but they stood over for the decision of this Court.

Mr. Gray said, to save time, and anticipating the order would be issued, he served a copy of it on the other side. When asked to show the original order, he got it and paid the fees. There was no intention to commit fraud. He had the consent of the other side to have the order drawn up.

Judgment deferred.

Ex parte W. John Payne.—An application was made on behalf of Mr. W. J. Payne for a rule calling upon the justices of Middlesex to show cause why a mandamus should not issue commanding them to assign to the applicant one of the districts of the county as coroner for that portion known as the liberty or franchise of the Duchy of Lancaster. In consequence of Mr. Wakley's death the county had been divided into districts under the Coroners Act, and Mr. Payne had applied to the justices to assign one of the districts to him, but they had declined, and both parties had come before the Court in this form to have

their Lordships' decision. In 1837 Mr. Payne was appointed by letters patent, under the Duchy of Lancaster, coroner for the franchise or liberty belonging to the duchy situate in Middlesex. The district contributed equally with the other parts of the county to the county rate, and the perquisites and fees of the coroner were paid out of the county rate, and the magistrates had commuted the fees into a salary under the provisions of the recent Act. Mr. Payne had always been recognized as a county coroner, and he had been returned as such by the magistrates. The question turned upon the construction of the 27th section of the 7 & 8 Vict. c. 92. After hearing the arguments of the learned counsel.

The COURT said the magistrates had no power to assign a district, as asked for by the applicant, and the rule must be refused.

(Sittings in Banco, before Justices WIGHTMAN, CROMPTON, and BLACKBURN.)

June 12.—The Queen v. Blundell.—In this case the defendant, an attorney, had been convicted upon an indictment for a libel, and sentenced to imprisonment in the Queen's Prison. He was subsequently brought up to this Court, and charged upon an attachment for non-payment of costs, and a rule was granted to estreat his recognizances.

An application was now made to make the rule absolute, no cause being shown.

The COURT made the rule absolute accordingly.

June 13.—In re Levy.—In this case a rule had been obtained calling upon Mr. Levy, an attorney, to show cause why he should not be struck off the rolls of this court, and to answer the matters in the affidavits. Mr. Levy was engaged in an action of *St. Albans v. The London General Omnibus Company*, which was tried twice, and the allegation was, that he had made an affidavit that a person of the name of Nathan, a doctor, had been paid the sum of £2 12s. by him, whereas he had only been paid £1 4s.; and also that he had made an affidavit that he could not find a person of the name of Barwick, whose evidence was of importance, whereas he had been furnished with Barwick's name and residence.

Cause was now shown against the rule, and several affidavits made by Mr. Levy, his clerks, and several other persons were read, contradicting some of the allegations and explaining others, and

The COURT were of opinion that the allegations were fully answered, but that the applicant for the rule believed his complaint was well founded, and discharged the rule without costs.

Rule discharged accordingly.

COURT OF COMMON PLEAS.

(Sittings in Banco, before Lord Chief Justice ERLE and Justices WILLIAMS, MELLOR, and BYLES.)

June 12.—Kennedy v. Broun.—This was an action brought by Mr. Kennedy, the barrister, against Mrs. Broun, formerly Mrs. Swinfen, for £20,000 for remuneration for his services as her counsel in the case of *Swinfen v. Swinfen*, and on account stated between them. The action was tried on the Midland Circuit, before Lord Chief Justice Cockburn, when a verdict was found for the plaintiff for the amount claimed; a rule having been obtained to set aside that verdict and to enter it for the defendants, pursuant to leave reserved, on the grounds that there was no matter in respect of which any legal liability existed, and no debt on an account stated, and that the verdict was against the weight of the evidence and that the learned judge had not left it to the jury whether they believed the plaintiffs or the defendant's version of the facts.

Mr. Kennedy in person to-day appeared to show cause against the rule.

The argument of Mr. Kennedy proceeded on the 13th, 14th, 16th, and 17th inst. At the rising of the Court on the latter day Lord Chief Justice Erle said the case must stand over until Michaelmas Term, as there would be no chance of there being a full Court in Banco again before next term. It was a case which required the attention of a full Court.

The further hearing of the case, therefore, stands adjourned until Michaelmas Term.

(Sittings in Banco, before Lord Chief Justice ERLE and Justices WILLIAMS, WILLES, and BYLES.)

June 14.—In re an Attorney.—A rule was moved for in this case, calling upon an attorney of the court to show cause why he should not pay £37 to the applicant in an action

brought by him through his next friend. The attorney was retained as the infant's attorney; and in the action brought, the jury returned a verdict for the plaintiff, damages £37. After the verdict, the defendant offered the attorney £50 in full of the damages and costs. The attorney communicated the offer to the infant's next friend. He declined the offer, but the attorney, notwithstanding, accepted the money. The attorney before the action promised that he would conduct the action without costs to the plaintiff. Application had been made to the attorney for the payment of the £37, but he declined to pay more than £10.

The LORD CHIEF JUSTICE said it was probable the attorney would satisfactorily answer the matter complained of. The learned counsel might take his rule, subject to all risks.

Rule granted accordingly.

June 14.—In the matter of Oldknow, an Attorney.—In this case a rule had been obtained calling upon the defendant to show cause why he should not hand over all the moneys he had received on behalf of a Mr. Hoffman. Mr. Oldknow had been Mr. Hoffman's attorney in two actions, out of which the present proceedings arose.

After hearing the arguments of counsel on both sides,

The LORD CHIEF JUSTICE said the Court had great doubt whether Mr. Oldknow's misconduct as an attorney in these cases had been brought up to that of receiving moneys belonging to his client and misappropriating them to his own use. Upon the most careful consideration of the facts the Court thought that the imputation against Mr. Oldknow fell short of that degree of guilt. But he had been guilty of considerable misconduct whereby his client's interests had been sacrificed. He had acted contrary to his client's instructions and the money he had received he had kept under the pretence (brought forward in an unsatisfactory manner) of bills of costs. The matter had been referred to the Master, and that officer had found that Mr. Oldknow had received £190 of Mr. Hoffman's money; and the Court now directed Mr. Oldknow to pay that sum over to Mr. Hoffman, together with the costs of the inquiry and of this rule. The rule would be absolute, so far as that was concerned, and the rest of the rule to stand over till the first day of next term, to see that the direction of the Court had been complied with. No execution, however, to issue till a fortnight after the costs had been taxed.

Judgment accordingly.

(Sittings in Banco, before Lord Chief Justice ERLE, and Justices WILLES and BYLES.)

June 16.—In re George Henry Bush.—An application was made in this case on behalf of the Incorporated Law Society, for a rule, calling upon George Henry Bush to show cause why he should not be attached for contempt of Court in falsely acting as an attorney and issuing a writ, &c.

The COURT granted the rule.

LORD MAYOR'S COURT.

(Before the RECORDER.)

June 14.—Greenhill v. White.—An attorney engaged in this case called the attention of the Court to the following circumstances. He stated that he was unavoidably absent when the case was called, and upon his arrival at the court he found—to his astonishment—that the counsel had agreed upon a special case. Applicant's counsel had no authority to enter into any such arrangement. The action was upon a guarantee for £6, and the course adopted by counsel would be to throw the case over until next November, entailing upon the suitors costs to the amount of £60.

The RECORDER said that such a course was not proper; but, as the case had been struck out, it could not again be brought under the notice of the Court.

The attorney having reiterated his complaint that the counsel had acted without any authority, the Recorder gave permission to apply to have the case restored for hearing upon a future occasion.

POLICE COURT, BOW STREET.

(Before Mr. CORRIE.)

June 14.—A pawnbroker was summoned for detaining an emerald and diamond ring, valued at £150.

It appeared that on the 3rd of May last the ring was taken to the shop of Mr. Dulin, Jeweller, of St. James's-street, for repair. On the 8th of May, five days afterwards, he pledged it at the shop of the defendant, who advanced £50 upon it.

It was contended on behalf of the pawnbroker that due caution had been observed in taking the pledge.

Mr. CORRIE said these proceedings were taken under the 2 & 3 Vict. c. 71, s. 27, but it was necessary to consider the purport of former Acts bearing upon the subject. After referring at some length to these, his worship observed that the real question was whether the words "agents entrusted with goods" embraced a tradesman entrusted with property to work upon or repair. The Factors Acts (6 Geo. 4, c. 94, and 5 & 6 Vict. c. 39) protected agents to whom "goods, wares, or merchandise" were consigned, firstly, with respect to "sales" and subsequently as to "pledges;" but neither in the courts of chancery nor in the common law courts had these enactments been held to apply to other than purely mercantile transactions, and he (Mr. Corrie) could have no difficulty in deciding that a tradesman entrusted with goods for repair was not an agent entitled to pledge such goods within the meaning of the Act. He therefore ordered the ring to be delivered up.

The pawnbroker's solicitor applied for a case, in order that the question might be tried in the Court of Queen's Bench. The magistrate granted it.

Parliament and Legislation.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Monday, June 16.

TRANSFER OF LAND BILL.

On the order of the day being read for the committee on this bill,

Sir H. CAIRNS moved that the bill be referred to a select committee. He wished, in the first place, to correct an error which had become prevalent with regard to this bill—namely, that it was merely a permissive bill. There could not be a greater mistake than that. It was perfectly true that it was a permissive bill in this sense, that no person need bring his title to be registered unless he pleased; but it was not a permissive bill with regard to proprietors of land adjoining property that was registered. The owner of land, in registering his title, might bring himself into conflict with the owners of the property all round him, and it would be compulsory upon those owners to take the necessary steps to see that their neighbour who was registering his title did not encroach upon their property. This would be the case in all questions of boundary, the rights of way, drainage, rights of sporting, &c. Although the bill, therefore, was a permissive measure in terms, it was a compulsory measure in substance. His next reason for referring the bill was, that it was entirely counter to the recommendations of the Royal commission of 1854. He thought the 5th and three following clauses especially required the revision of a select committee from the lax manner in which they were drawn. The 5th clause provided that titles should be examined by the registrar of titles, as General Orders should direct. All the information that was given with regard to the examination of an indefeasible title was, that some General Orders should be issued. Those orders were not defined by Act of Parliament, nor was there any parliamentary security as to how the examination should be conducted by the registrar and examiners of title. The Lord Chancellor might appoint as many examiners of title as he pleased, and they might be street-sweepers as far as they were defined by this bill. Their remuneration, even, was not stated. The clause provided that no title should be accepted for registration as indefeasible unless it were such as a court of equity would hold to be valid and marketable. That was a principle that was wholly novel, and certainly not to be found in the Irish measure. A court of equity merely decided between two parties; it did not establish a title. The 6th clause provided that in case of any doubt or dispute, the matter might be referred to a court of equity, and the registrar would decide such reference. If he were a timid or a slothful man, he would be sure to order such reference. But the strangest clause of all was the 7th. It commenced, "If on such investigation it shall appear that the title is good and marketable save in respect of some contingency that has not happened"—why, who ever heard of a contingency that had happened?—"or some uncertainty that could not be ascertained"—as if an uncertainty could be ascertained. Under that clause nothing could be finally settled in the case of an estate the absolute ownership of which was subject to a contingency. Then he came to the 8th clause, which was, in his opinion, the climax of these mistakes and contradictions. That clause provided that if a

title should be found to be good and marketable, the applicant should furnish to the registrar an exact description of the land, as well as a statement of the persons that were to become entitled to it, and of the charges and incumbrances to which it was subject. That was surely a very extraordinary provision, for all those latter details should follow on its being found that the title to the land was "good and marketable," and such a discovery in the ordinary course of things should of necessity precede all those questions of boundaries, of ownership, and of incumbrances. He had never heard a more complete instance than that of "putting the cart before the horse."

Mr. COLLIER opposed the amendment.

Mr. WALPOLE supported the amendment.

Mr. MALINS said he had already stated, on the second reading, that he thought the measure was one of no value. He did not think it worth passing, and he believed that no select committee could make it worth passing. He was persuaded that any measure upon that subject that was not of a compulsory character must remain a dead letter. The bill was an experiment, which would probably cost the country something like £10,000 a year. The real question, then, was, whether it was worth while to spend that sum of money for the purpose of making such an experiment. Now, although he had the worst possible opinion of the bill, he was yet not disinclined to allow the experiment to be made, seeing that it was a measure which the Government had chosen to introduce on its own responsibility. He looked upon sending it to a select committee as a snare, and suggested as the best of all courses that the Government should withdraw it, and introduce a new bill at an early meeting of Parliament, in order that the question might be fully considered, and a bill passed which would be worthy of the country.

Mr. ROLT said the select committee which had been appointed to inquire into the registration of insurances had made one of the most able reports that had ever been submitted to the House, and yet this bill totally disregarded its recommendation. He believed that if the present measure were sent to a committee that committee would be able to deal with the questions raised summarily, and return the measure to the House in ample time to enable it to become law this session. The measure before them dealt with two questions totally different from one another—namely, the registration of title and the declaration of indefeasibility. It was idle to proceed with this bill without taking the next into consideration also—namely, the Declaration of Title Bill. On these grounds he was strongly of opinion that the measure should be submitted to a select committee.

Sir F. GOLDSMID thought the bill should be considered in a committee of the whole House.

The SOLICITOR-GENERAL opposed the amendment.

The House then divided. The numbers were—

For going into committee	180
Against	124
Majority	—56

The House then went into committee on the bill.

Clauses 1, 2, 3, and 4 were agreed to.

On clause 5,

Sir F. KELLY suggested that the clause should be postponed, in order that the Solicitor-General might maturely consider the constitution of the proposed new tribunal, and whether the work might not be better performed by the existing Courts of Chancery, or by a commission. He objected altogether to the power of appointing the registrar and assistant registrars and examiners of titles and clerks to be appointed under the bill. The registrar was to be one, the assistant registrars were to be limited to three; but the examiners of titles and clerks were to be an indefinite number, to be determined by the Lord Chancellor, who would thereby be invested with the power of unlimited taxation. The salary of the registrar was to be £2,500 a year; but as to the assistant registrars, clerks, messengers, and servants, such salaries were to be paid as the Lord Chancellor should determine. He objected to the mode of business to be transacted under the bill being left to be determined by General Orders of the Lord Chancellor; and for these reasons he moved that the clause be postponed.

Some discussion then ensued, and

The committee divided on the question that the clause be postponed—

Ayes	21
Noes	63
Majority	—42

Sir F. KELLY believed the clause would not carry out the

object of the bill, and as a protest against it moved the omission of the words "registrar and examiners of title."

The amendment was put and negatived, and the clause was then agreed to.

Clause 6 was also agreed to.

Clause 7, after some further discussion, was agreed to.

On clause 8,

The SOLICITOR-GENERAL said it was to settle the formula of the register.

Mr. WALPOLE pointed out that by the preceding clauses it was supposed that an indefeasible title had been shown, but by the clause they were not only to have a registration of titles to land, but of boundaries of property, and the effect would be to force persons to raise questions as to boundaries which they were content to permit to lie dormant. And then as to the abstracts to be placed on the records, who were to make them? the registrars and their clerks, who might leave out words of the greatest importance. To carry out the objects sought by this bill they must have a registry of conveyances as well as a registry of titles. He should therefore oppose this clause.

The SOLICITOR-GENERAL contended that the only object of the bill was to put the real title on the record, and not part of it only, and therefore it was necessary that there should be a registry of all dealings with and encumbrances on land. With regard to the question of boundaries, he would remind the House that a clause similar to the one on this subject in the present bill had been found to work well in the Irish bill.

Sir F. KELLY supported the motion for the omission of the clause.

Mr. SELWYN also supported the motion for the omission of the clause.

Sir H. CAIRNS said there were no provisions for the security of persons out of the country, of infants, of persons of imbecile mind, or persons unborn. The only provision was that the registrar should consider who were the persons interested; but suppose the registrar should make a mistake? That mistake would give an indefeasible title against all persons to whom he had referred. It was utterly impossible that this system ever could work.

The committee then divided.

For the clause 140

Against it 89

Majority —51

The clause was ordered to stand part of the bill.

Clause 9 was also agreed to.

On clause 10,

Mr. M. SMITH moved an amendment in the clause with a view of requiring an accurate description of the property to be embodied in the notice.

The SOLICITOR-GENERAL acceded to the amendment, and suggested the further addition of words requiring a map or plan of the property in question to be deposited.

The clause, as amended, was agreed to.

Clause 11 was agreed to.

On clause 12, having reference to notices upon all parties interested,

Mr. WALPOLE suggested the omission of the clause as being wholly unnecessary.

Mr. BOUVERIE concurred with the right hon. gentleman in his objection to this clause.

Sir F. GOLDSMID thought the clause was necessary, but that the object of it should be more clearly defined.

Mr. M. SMITH urged the addition of certain words, so as to render its object more clear.

The clause was then agreed to.

Clause 13 was also agreed to, after which

The CHAIRMAN reported progress and the House resumed.

TRANSFER OF LAND (STAMPS).

This bill passed through committee.

COURTS OF JUSTICE BUILDING BILL.

The order for the second reading of this bill was discharged.

CHANCERY REGULATION BILL.

The Lords' amendments to this bill were further considered and disagreed with.

JUDGMENTS, &c., LAW AMENDMENT.

Mr. HADFIELD obtained leave to bring in a bill to amend the law relating to judgments, executions, statutes, recognisances, and *lites pendentes*.

The bill was brought up and read a first time.

Recent Decisions.

EQUITY.

TENANT FOR LIFE UNDER SETTLEMENT—CONVERSION.

In re Bagot's Settlement, V. C. K., 10 W. R. 607.

Although the general principles relating to the conversion of real estate into personalty and *e converso*, have been long and clearly established, nevertheless the complications incident to practice—the *ardua vita*—sometimes give rise necessarily to great difficulty in the application of the general laws of this branch of equity jurisprudence. So much is this the case, that, subordinately to the paramount influence of the general rules referred to, certain special classes of cases possess such peculiarities of circumstance as to give rise to a set of equitable rules that are often seemingly at variance with the more primary class of principles from which they are, in fact, derived. This conflict of laws that are, in many respects, mutually correlated, reminds us of that numerous class of chemical phenomena where the compounds by no means contain the properties of the simple elements precisely in the degree of their admixture, but derive from the process of fusion or solution some new quality not found in the elements constituting their substance. The reader will find (*ante* 525) the general principles of equitable conversion treated of in connection with a case that may be found to throw some further light upon them. At present we shall consider this department of equity jurisprudence only in connection with a particular class of cases of conversion—viz., where the property is sold by the Court or under an Act of Parliament.

It is clear from the case of *Browley v. Gooders*, 1 A. 75, that if any part of the real estate of a bankrupt vested in his assignees for payment of his creditors, remain unsold at the time of his death, and the creditors have been fully satisfied, it will go, in case of intestacy, to his heir-at-law. If the realty of the bankrupt be sold or contracted to be sold in his lifetime, it will be considered as converted, and upon his death intestate, his heir will not be entitled to it. He will take it, however, if the sale or contract for sale be entered into after the death of the bankrupt. The case of *Banks v. Scott*, 5 Madd. 493, illustrates both these propositions. There, part of the real estate of the bankrupt Scott was sold during his life; part was contracted to be sold but not sold at the time of his death; and the remainder was sold after his death. A surplus remained in the hands of the assignees. It was held by Sir John Leach, V.C., that the heir of Scott had no claim in respect of the estates sold or contracted to be sold in the lifetime of Scott, but that he was entitled to the overplus after payment of creditors arising from the estates sold after the death of the bankrupt. "It can make no difference in principle," his Honour observed in that case, "whether such a charge be created by provision of the law or the provision of the party. As far as the real estate is not exhausted by the charge created by provisions of the bankrupt laws for the payment of his debts, it is the property of the heir." The death of the owner of land often alters the rights of his heir and personal representative. For instance, where a mortgage deed of freehold contains a power of sale with a direction that the surplus moneys to arise from the sale, shall be paid to the mortgagor, his executors or administrators, if the estate is sold by the mortgagee in the lifetime of the mortgagor the surplus moneys (if any) are, as the reader is aware, personalty. If the equity of redemption, however, devolves upon the heir or devisee, he will be entitled to any surplus produce arising from a sale subsequently made (*Wright v. Rose*, 2 M. & S. 32, 324. See also *Bourne v. Bourne*, 2 Haro 35). But where under a decree of the Court, more real estate is sold than is necessary for payment of mortgage or other debts, the surplus will still retain the character of realty. Thus, in *Cook v. Dealey*, 22 Beav. 196, an estate was devised to a married woman, subject to the payment of the testator's debts. The estates were afterwards sold under a decree in an administration suit to which the devisee was a party. After payment of debts there remained a sum in court. On the death of the devisee it was held by Sir John Romilly, M.R., that the heir-at-law of the devisee and not her husband was entitled to it. (See also *Jerry v. Preston*, 13 Sim. 356, 366.)

The question of conversion arises frequently in cases where land has been taken by companies under the Lands Clauses Consolidation Act. *In re Harrop's Estate*, 3 Drew. 726, will be found a good exemplification of the law applicable to cases of this description. Money, the purchase of real estate, to a share of which A. was entitled, was paid into court in 1642 under certain local Acts. In 1648 A. was sentenced to seven

years' transportation, and his share of the money was carried to a certain account. After the lapse of the seven years A. applied to the Court to have his share paid to him. His Honour held him entitled to it as realty. If it had become converted into personality it would, of course, have gone to the Crown. In this case it was laid down by his Honour that if "the circumstances of the case have brought it under the 69th section of the Lands Clauses Consolidation Act, the money has been held to bear the character of realty; but if, on the other hand, the circumstances have brought the case under the 78th section of that Act, then the money has been held personally." Where land has been taken by a company under the Lands Clauses Consolidation Act from a person who was and continued until his death in a state of mental imbecility, but was not the subject of a commission of lunacy, and the money was paid into court, it was held by Lord Cranworth, V.C., after the death of the landowner, that the money was not to be reinvested in or considered as land, but was to be paid to his personal representatives, his Lordship being of opinion that the money ought to be treated "as being paid in by a party seized in fee and competent to sell." (See *Ex parte Flamank*, 1 Sim. N. S. 260.) The present case turned somewhat upon the construction of a special Act. It contains clauses, however, relating to persons under disability and to owners in fee substantially the same as the corresponding ones in the Lands Clauses Act. As local Acts are, as a general rule, modelled with a close reference to the principles of the Lands Clauses Act, questions turning upon the construction of the former may be solved by a reference to cases under the latter Act. In the present case A., being tenant for life under a marriage settlement with the ultimate remainder to himself in fee, contracted with a railway company to sell absolutely to them. The tenant for life, after all the other limitations had failed, specifically devised the land in settlement. No conveyance was executed to the company, who paid interest to the tenant for life during his life and those in remainder, and subsequently paid money into court under the Special Act. Vice-Chancellor Kindersley held that there was no conversion, and that the specific devise failed. The only general principle that appears to underlie compulsory sales in their relation to conversion, is that the Court very strongly leans against a conversion. "That is the sound principle" the Vice-Chancellor observed in the case of *In re Stewart*, 1 Sm. & G. 39; "and there must be strong words in the Act to induce the Court to consider that the fund has been converted into personality." There are numerous cases, however, infringing upon this principle. For instance, where the owner in fee of land, having devised it to an infant, agreed with a railway company under their compulsory powers to sell a portion of it to them, the owner died before the completion of the purchase without having altered his will, it was held by Sir J. Romilly, M.R., that the executors of the landowner and not the devisee, were entitled to the purchase-money, and to the compensation for severance: *In re the Manchester and Southport Railway Company*, 19 Beav. 365. The present case differs from the last, inasmuch as the property sold was in settlement. This circumstance, of course, is a strong bar to conversion in any case. In its absence the question of conversion, independently of the bearing of a local Act, will, in the case of a sale to a public company, mainly depend (subject to the principle just mentioned) upon the section under which the money is paid into court.

COMMON LAW.

TRESPASS IN PURSUIT OF GAME—ENTRY TO TAKE DEAD GAME.

Osborn v. Meadows, C. P., 10 W. R. 537.

To constitute the offence of trespassing upon land in search or pursuit of game within sect. 30 of statute 1 & 2 Will. 4, c. 32, there must be a personal entering or being upon the land in question; a mere constructive entry, such as might suffice to constitute a trespass at common law, will not be sufficient to sustain a conviction under the above section which speaks of *entering or being upon land*. It has been decided in the case of *Reg. v. Pratt*, 4 El. & Bl. 860, that such land may be a highway. In that case the defendant whilst on the highway sent his dog into an adjoining covert, and afterwards, being still upon such highway, fired at a pheasant that flew across the highway. The conviction was there upheld by the Court of Queen's Bench, because the defendant was considered to be a trespasser upon the highway; for, as it was there said, the soil and freehold of the highway belongs to the owner

of the adjoining land, subject only to the right of easement in the public to use it for all the purposes of a highway.

In the present case the defendant was convicted of trespassing in pursuit of game within the above section under the following circumstances:—The defendant on his own ground, where he had the right of shooting, shot a pheasant, which was on his neighbour's land, where he had no such right, and afterwards went on to his neighbour's land and picked up the pheasant. The ground of this decision was, that the shooting by the defendant, and the subsequent entry upon his neighbour's land, were only one transaction, the two together constituting a trespass in search or pursuit of game. Probably it would have been considered equally a sufficient trespass under sect. 30, if, under similar circumstances, the defendant, after shooting, when upon his own ground, a pheasant on his neighbour's ground, had sent his gamekeeper or any other person to pick up the pheasant, as the maxim of law, *qui facit per alium facit per se*, would no doubt have been held to apply to such a case.

There was another point raised in the present case but not decided, and that was, how far could the subsequent entry and picking up the dead bird be properly considered a trespass in search or pursuit of game within the above section. The Court of Queen's Bench, in *Loom v. Bailey*, 9 W. R. 119, had held that the word "game," as used in the 4th section, which relates to licensed dealers in game, and so manifestly includes "dead" game, was also applicable to "live" pheasants. It seems therefore to follow that the word "game" ought to receive a similar interpretation throughout the whole Act, and consequently that under sect. 30, both "live" and "dead" game were intended to be included. On the other hand, it does certainly appear strange to make the words "*search or pursuit*," as used in the latter section, refer in any way to dead game, as both those words seem to point to the conclusion of taking or capturing only *live* animals, and consequently would hardly justify the idea that any other than *live* game was intended by that section.

CRIMINAL LAW.

MURDER—ACCESSORY BEFORE THE FACT.

Reg. v. Francis Fretwell, 10 W. R. 545.

By the 11 & 12 Vict. c. 46, s. 1, it was enacted, that if any person should become an accessory before the fact to any felony, whether the same was a felony at common law or by virtue of any statute, such person might be indicted, tried, and punished in all respects as if he were a principal felon. In the case of *Reg. v. Gaylor*, 1 Dear. & B. C. C. R. 288, the prisoner was indicted for the manslaughter of his wife. It appeared that he gave some sulphate of potash to his wife for the purpose of procuring abortion, and that she believing herself to be pregnant, although in reality she was not, took the sulphate of potash in his absence and died from its effects. It was contended in that case that there could be no accessories in manslaughter. Erle, J., in convicting on the above charge, said, "If the manslaughter be *per infortunium*, or *se defendendo*, there would be no accessory, but there are other cases of manslaughter in which there may be accessories." Since the passing of the above Act, the first section of which has been re-enacted *totidem verbis* by the 24 & 25 Vict. c. 94, s. 1, it is immaterial upon an indictment for felony, whether a man be a principal in the first or second degree, or an accessory before the fact, as in each case he may be indicted as a principal.

In the present case the Court held that a man was not guilty of murder, who at the request of a married woman, had procured poison for the purpose of producing abortion, from the effects of which she died. The prisoner neither administered the poison, nor was he present when it was taken, but he procured and delivered it to the deceased, with the full knowledge to which she intended to apply it. As the prisoner was an accessory before the fact, and as the above statutes have made the crime of being an accessory before the fact a substantive felony (see *Reg. v. Hughes*, 8 W. R. 195), the prisoner was tried on the charge of murder. Another question was also raised in this case, and that was—how far could a man who was an accessory to the misdemeanour of a woman in taking poison for the purpose of procuring abortion be held to be an accessory to the self-murder of the woman, if death should ensue, contrary to the intention of the parties? or was the crime of which the woman was guilty a *felo de se*? The Court did not think it necessary to decide this question, as they found that under the circumstances it might well be that the prisoner hoped that the deceased would change her intention of taking the poison.

Correspondence.

LORD CRANWORTH'S SECURITY FOR PURCHASER'S BILL.

In your remarks the week before last upon the rival Land Transfer Bills now before the House of Commons, after declaring your preference for Lord Cranworth's plan as being cheaper and simpler than that of the Lord Chancellor, you qualified your adhesion by doubting whether it would be possible to introduce sufficient checks for fraud. Even with the checks you propose, Lord Cranworth's plan may bear comparison with other plans for official registration; but as these checks involve the intervention of some official or quasi-official registrar, I regard them as departures from the leading principle of Lord Cranworth's plan, which, while giving complete security against suppressed incumbrances, will keep the title independent of everything except what may appear upon the title deeds. Under a system of official registration, it would be generally necessary to employ an agent in addition to the solicitor, and the whole transaction would be complicated and mysterious, and therefore errors and omissions, and even frauds would be much more likely than under a system in which everything bearing upon the title is within the reach of the holder of the title-deeds, and his advisers for the time being. With this opinion as to the merits of Lord Cranworth's plan, and being very anxious that it may become law, and may work sufficiently well to induce the Legislature to convert it before long into a general measure applicable to all freehold property, I wish to say a few words as to certain opportunities for fraud which I must admit it leaves open, and as to the extent to which they may be closed up.

I shall assume that, upon the granting of a certificate of indefeasible title, the previous title-deeds will be either impounded or marked in such a manner as to render it impossible to deduce a title to the property without disclosing that it had been made subject to Lord Cranworth's Acts. Every purchaser of or incumbrancer upon any such property will therefore have notice that he must get his purchase or mortgage-deed memorialized, and will have no difficulty, either in determining the instrument, (whether the certificate of title itself, or some subsequent conveyance) upon which it ought to be memorialized, or in ascertaining that the successive conveyances forming the series leading up to the certificate of title, have been severally duly memorialized. The memorial being thus duly endorsed upon the deed conveying the property to the vendor or mortgagee, there appear to be only two imaginable ways in which such vendor or mortgagor, supposing him to retain the deed of conveyance to himself, could make out his title under that deed without disclosing the existence of the memorialized deed: (1) he may have a duplicate of the deed of conveyance to himself, or (2) he may succeed in erasing the memorial and restoring the parchment to its original state without affecting the writing of the original deed on the other side of the skin. Frauds of the first kind could be rendered almost impossible by requiring every person who should execute more than one copy of a deed to make the later copies as the 2nd, the 3rd, &c., and making even an unintentional omission involve, in addition to a pecuniary penalty, the liability to make good any loss which might result from the fraud thus rendered possible. A deliberate conspiracy between two successive owners to concoct duplicate conveyances from the one to the other, stamped as originals, would still be possible, but as the date of a deed's being stamped cannot be altered, this conspiracy must be almost simultaneous with the original conveyance, and men of apparent respectability so rarely combine to commit a criminal offence, that this possibility need only be borne in mind, as a reason for not dispensing with all inquiries as to the persons with whom one deals. The feasibility of frauds of the second kind, those to be effected by erasing memorials, and the best expedients for preventing them, are subjects upon which most of your readers are better qualified to judge than I am, and I prefer to leave the question in their hands, only suggesting that, if it be considered possible to erase ink-writing because it only sinks a little way into the parchment, letters traced out by small holes pierced through the parchment with some pointed instrument previously dipped in printers' ink would probably prove indelible, and that it would be sufficient to write the date of the memorialized deed, and the name of the purchaser in indelible characters. In order to ensure proper care being taken to make the memorial indelible, I should be disposed to make the purchaser responsible for any loss which might result from his memorial being successfully erased. I believe the two kinds of fraud I have discussed above are the

only ones which are possible under Lord Cranworth's plan, and not equally so under a system of the official registration of deeds, and I think I have shown that they can be almost entirely prevented. It seems that the Lord Chancellor's Bill is to become law this session; but if Lord Cranworth's be allowed the same privilege, I feel confident that it will soon be found to be not only cheaper, but really much more secure, at least so long as no compensation is provided for those who may suffer from the mistakes which will be made, and the imposition which will be practised upon the Registrars of the Lord Chancellor's Bill.

H. R. D.

ELECTION OF CORONERS FOR MIDDLESEX.

A curious point as to the right of voting at this election has occurred to me.

It seems to be assumed as incontestable that the right of electing county coroners is, by the common law (unaffected, as to this, by any existing enactment), vested in the possessors of an interest of freehold in the county, whether legal or equitable, and without any restriction as to amount in value. (Jervis on Coroners, by Welsby, 2nd ed. pp. 23, 24).

It seems to be a corollary from the case of *Baxter v. Brown*, 7 M. & G. 198, that shareholders in any joint stock company possessing freehold land are entitled to the county franchise, in respect of their shares, if their respective interest *pro rata* be sufficient to reach the required Parliamentary standard, unless the company be incorporated, or by some special or general Act of Parliament, their shares be declared to be personal property. A declaration in the deed of settlement that the shares shall, as to the shareholders "*inter se*" be deemed personal property to all intents and purposes, although it may operate in equity as a conversion of the property, does not appear to affect this point, and all the cases on the Statute of Frauds, mortmain, or probate, or legacy duty, would seem to leave the doctrine of *Baxter v. Brown* untouched; indeed, the authority of the latter case, as to the point in question, was recognised by Lord St. Leonards in his final judgment in the well considered case of *Myers v. Perigall*, 2 D. G. M. & G. 599.

On the preceding assumptions a very considerable number of persons would probably be found to be legally entitled to vote at the approaching election—namely, (*inter alia*) the holders of shares in those joint stock banks in the metropolis who have purchased and hold freehold property within the county for the purposes of their business, such property having been conveyed to trustees in trust for the shareholders; a state of facts which it is believed will apply to most of the older and important joint stock banks.

It must be remembered that no registration is exacted as a qualification for voting at this election, the *bonâ fide* acquisition of the required interest, without any improper view to the purpose of the election, being all that is necessary.

The judgment of the Lord Chief Justice Tindal in the case referred to, of *Baxter v. Brown*, which will repay perusal, proves that the law will rather lean to extend than restrict the circle of competency for an elective franchise which is inherent in the owners of freehold, and that nothing short of the clear language of an Act of Parliament will suffice to take away such right, which is vested in its possessors not for their own benefit, but for that of the community of which they form a part.

The deductions I have ventured to indicate appear to me to be warranted from the doctrine found in the authorities referred to, and it may perhaps, at the present time, interest some of your readers to test the soundness of these conclusions and pursue the investigation more minutely than has been attempted by, Sir,—yours very obediently,

Lincoln's-inn, June 18, 1862.

LAWYERS FOR CORONERS.

Section 18 of 7 & 8 Vict. c. 92, clearly shows that the Legislature at the time of the passing of that Act took it for granted that lawyers were the most, if not the only, qualified persons for the office of coroner. By that section it is enacted, "That from and after the passing of this Act, in all cases in which any person shall be charged by any coroner's inquisition with the commission of any crime, and shall be subsequently put upon his trial, either on such inquisition, or in pursuance of any bill of indictment found for the same, the coroner before whom such inquisition shall have been found shall be wholly incompetent to act as an attorney in prosecution or defence of such person for such crime, either by himself or

his partner (directly or indirectly); and that in all cases in which it shall appear to the judge before whom such person shall be tried that any coroner shall have so acted contrary to the provision and intention of this Act, such judge shall impose upon every coroner so offending such penalty, not exceeding fifty pounds, as the said judge shall in his discretion think fit.

W. T.

TRESPASS IN PURSUIT OF GAME.

Your correspondent "K," in the last number of the *Solicitors' Journal* (ante, 596), wishes to know whether the defendant, who was summoned for trespassing in the daytime in pursuit of game, and who in answer thereto set up a claim of right, ought not to be compelled to prove, by way of defence, the licence and consent of the owner under sect. 42 of the 1 & 2 Will. 4, c. 32. As I gather the facts from the statement, the defendant was an occupier, and the charge against him was for taking up snares for hares or conies on land in his own occupation. The charge would, therefore, come under sect. 12, and not, as stated by your correspondent, under sect. 30, which does not apply to occupiers as such, (*vide Spicer v. Bernard*, 5 Jur. N. S. 961); and the former section of the Act, as your correspondent is, no doubt, aware, does not include rabbits. With respect to the general question asked as to how far the *onus* lies upon the defendant to prove his case under sect. 42, I may state, in the first instance, that an information under sect. 12 against the occupier of land for pursuing game on such land must distinctly aver, in the words of the section, that the offence was committed without the authority of the owner (*vide Fletcher v. Calthorp*, 6 Q. B. 880), the principle as stated in that case being, that when a certain act is made punishable by summary conviction, which may be lawful if performed under different circumstances, those circumstances must be negated in the conviction. As the defendant had in the case stated by your correspondent, the *prima facie* right of taking hares and rabbits, and as no evidence was produced on the part of the complainant to show that the right to the game or rabbits had been reserved by the lessor, it seems to me that the question was one purely for the justices to determine—they are, in fact, the sole judges of whether the claim is *bonâ fide* (*Legg v. Pardoe*, 9 C. B. N. S. 289), and also as to the weight of the evidence, which ought not to be less either in kind or degree than would be sufficient to get a conviction if the case were to be left to a jury.

D.

NEW BANKRUPTCY ACT.

The expenses in working bankruptcies in the County Courts are indeed heavy; but creditors do expect after all the forms the law requires have been complied with, to receive their small dividends as early as practicable. Yet on application to the Registrar of the Court, they are told "You can't receive your money: no orders have been issued as to the mode in which dividends in county courts are to be paid." How long is this to be so?

E. J. C.

POWER OF APPOINTMENT—STAMP DUTY.

A., having a power of appointment over a large sum of money in favour of his younger children, appoints a part of it to one of them, reserving to himself a power of revocation. The interest of the appointee passed to her residuary legatee. After her death, the appointor made the appointment absolute.

I shall feel much obliged by any of your readers informing me whether the stamp on the probate of the appointees' will should merely cover the value of her interest under the revocable appointment, or under the absolute appointment.

W. M. S.

THE MIDDLESEX CORONERSHIPS.

On Monday last a special meeting of the magistracy of the county of Middlesex was held at the Sessions House, Clerkenwell, to consider the question of the assignment of one of the districts of the county to any one holding the office of coroner in the county.

The coronership of the eastern division of the county was assigned to Mr. John Humphreys.

A memorial from Mr. W. J. Payne, coroner for the Duchy and Liberty of Lancaster, asking as one of the coroners acting in and for the county, to be appointed to one of the sub-divisions, was laid before the Court, and Mr. Payne was heard in support of his memorial.

After some discussion the following resolutions were submitted to the Court and approved:—

"That Mr. Payne's memorial having been read, with the opinion of the Attorney and Solicitor-General, resolved, that Mr. Payne not being a coroner of the county within the meaning of the Act of Parliament, this Court has no power to assign to him either division of the county to act as coroner in either of such divisions."

"That, acting on the opinion of the law officers of the Crown, the application of Mr. Payne for a district to be assigned to him to be refused."

A public meeting of the freeholders of Marylebone was held at the theatre of the Marylebone Literary and Scientific Institution, Edwards-street, Portman-square, on Monday evening, for the purpose of hearing Mr. Charles E. Lewis enunciate his views as one of the candidates for the office of coroner for the central division of Middlesex. Thomas D'Iffanger, Esq., presided over a numerously attended and highly influential meeting.

Amongst the supporters on the platform were Sir Robert Carden, C. Mills Roche, Esq.,—Mitchell, Esq., J. S. W. Her-ring, Esq., T. Filmer, Esq., James Bird, Esq., &c.

The CHAIRMAN, in a few words, opened the proceedings.

Mr. CHARLES EDWARD LEWIS, then stood forward and stated his views at very considerable length. As a young man he asked them to throw away the rusty notion that grey hairs were the proper qualification. He regretted his opponents were not disposed to leave the result of the contest as a simple question which was the best man, and let the electors decide upon it; but they foisted two questions upon them—one, that it must be a medical man and not a lawyer: and the other, he was ashamed to say, was that it must be a liberal, and not a conservative. He warmly repudiated in this age of liberty the attempt to make the qualification for this office of quasi-judicial position and of simple duty a political question. He argued that it was simply and entirely a disgrace to any man who uttered the sentiment, and he would scorn to put himself forward for their suffrages upon political grounds, whatever might be the consequences. There might be some advantages to the public by having a medical man as coroner, but the preponderating argument in the question, he maintained, was to have a man for the office trained to the use of courts of justice and the law. No one would deny that the majority of cases came under that category, and, excepting, perhaps, in cases of poisoning, the public must admit that the man of law was much more fitted than the man of medicine. He cited many recent important cases to prove his arguments in favour of his profession, and concluded by assuring them of his intention to contest the election to his uttermost.

The meeting unanimously adopted the following resolution, moved by Mr. Clement George, and seconded by Mr. Filmer:—

"That this meeting is of opinion that Mr. Charles Edward Lewis, by profession and attainments, is eminently qualified for the office of coroner for the central district of Middlesex, and cordially recommend him to the support of the freeholders."

Mr. C. E. Lewis addressed another numerous and influential meeting of freeholders on Tuesday evening, at Lawson's Assembly Rooms, Gower-street, at which the following resolution was put and carried unanimously, and with the greatest acclamation:—

"That having heard the able and eloquent address of Mr. Charles Edward Lewis, this meeting of freeholders is of opinion that he is pre-eminently and especially qualified for the proper discharge of those duties of coroner for the central division of Middlesex, and pledges itself to give him its united support in his candidature for that important office."

Mr. Lewis has since addressed several other meetings, at which he met with enthusiastic receptions and received promises of support.

Mr. D. E. CAMERON, of Buckingham-street, Adelphi, who is also a candidate for the central division, addressed a meeting of the freeholders on Wednesday evening, at the Durham Castle Tavern, Seven Sisters-road, Holloway. Mr. Cameron was very warmly received by the meeting. After stating his own claims, he alluded to the question which he said seemed to be raised in this contest, as to whether a legal or medical candidate was the most eligible, contending that as medical evidence was invariably given before the coroner and jury, that the coroner, acting as judge, could introduce any opinion of his own amounting to crochets or theories, and so in fact making himself both witness and judge.

A resolution that Mr. Cameron was fully qualified to fulfil the duties of coroner was unanimously carried.

On Monday evening Dr. Lankester, the candidate for the same division, addressed the freeholders at the Barnsbury Hall, Islington; Mr. H. Spicer in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN introduced Dr. Lankester to the meeting.

Dr. LANKESTER contended that coroners ought to be medical men, as they were better acquainted with the human body, and the cause of death, than any gentleman of the legal profession could be. He said there was no more law required in a coroner's inquest than could be learned by any man present in twenty-four hours.

On Wednesday evening Mr. JAMES BIRD, of New Inn, Strand, who is a candidate for the western division, addressed the freeholders, at the King's Arms Tavern, Kensington, for the purpose of explaining his qualifications for the office of coroner, and to solicit their support in the forthcoming election.

Mr. BIRD, who was well received, defined the duty of a coroner, and objected to a medical man being a coroner because he could not understand legal jurisprudence. A coroner could not be sworn and give evidence, and therefore his medical knowledge would be of no use in the office. If a medical man were elected there would be a repetition of the scenes that had been witnessed between Mr. Wakley and the medical witnesses, where the Coroner set up his own opinion against theirs, and so directed the jury.

A resolution that Mr. Bird was qualified to fill the office of coroner was carried unanimously, and a working committee was then formed for the district of Kensington.

University Intelligence.

OXFORD.

In a Congregation held on the 13th inst., a form of statute for establishing temporarily a reader in Indian jurisprudence was read and promulgated.

The DEAN OF CHRIST CHURCH explained the objects of the statute. He reminded the House that last autumn a decree had been passed providing a reader for one year at a stipend of £300 per annum. At the same time a pledge had been given that in case it were desired to make the appointment more permanent, a statute would be brought forward. That pledge was now redeemed. It was proposed still to give the arrangement a temporary character, since it was to be hoped that ultimately the two law professorships already existing might be made available in this direction. The stipend was to be reduced to £200 per annum, the professor being allowed to take fees within certain limits. The mode of appointment might perhaps be objected to. It had been thought that a Board was better than a body of persons in a case where special qualifications were required, which would have to be inquired into very carefully, and that a small Board was better than a large one. There would, of course, be objections made to any Board that might be named. The Council had thought the Vice-Chancellor and Proctors the fittest existing board for the purpose, but they were quite ready to entertain any other suggestion.

Professor ROGERS gave the statute in most respects his warm approval, but objected to the appointment by the Vice-Chancellor and proctors, suggesting the Council as the fittest body to possess such patronage. He expressed a hope that the clause determining the electoral body would be made the subject of a separate vote.

Law Students' Journal.

EXAMINATIONS AT THE INCORPORATED LAW SOCIETY.

TRINITY TERM, 1862.

At the examination of candidates for admission on the roll of attorneys and solicitors of the superior courts, the examiners recommended the following gentlemen, under the age of 26, as being entitled to honorary distinction:—

Edward Francis Roberts, aged 21, who served his clerkship to Mr. Samuel Johnson Roberts, of Chester; and Messrs. Johnson & Weatheralls, of London.

John Shelly, aged 22, who served his clerkship to Messrs. Rooker, Lavers, & Matthews, of Plymouth; and Messrs. Vizard & Anstie, of London.

Walter James Sedgefield, aged 22, who served his clerkship to Mr. James Badcock Sedgefield, of Abingdon; and Mr. John Baker, of London.

James Roger Bramble, aged 21, who served his clerkship to Mr. James George Hobbs, of Bristol; and Mr. Thomas Baker, jun., of London.

Henry William Trinder, aged 21, who served his clerkship to Messrs. Trinder & Eyre, of London; and Messrs. Gadaden & Flower, of London.

The Council of the Incorporated Law Society have accordingly awarded the following prizes of books:—

To Mr. Roberts, the prize of the Honourable Society of Clifford's Inn.

To Mr. Shelly, one of the prizes of the Incorporated Law Society.

To Mr. Sedgefield, one of the prizes of the Incorporated Law Society.

To Mr. Bramble, one of the prizes of the Incorporated Law Society.

To Mr. Trinder, one of the prizes of the Incorporated Law Society.

The examiners have also certified that the following candidates whose names are placed in alphabetical order passed examinations which entitle them to commendation:—

James Thomas Abbey, aged 21, who served his clerkship to Messrs. Thompson & Cook, of Hull; and Mr. Robert Marshall, of London.

Joseph Ansell, jun., aged 21, who served his clerkship to Messrs. Gem, Docker, & Sutton, of Birmingham; and Messrs. Rennolls, of London.

John Ness Dransfield, aged 22, who served his clerkship to Mr. John Dransfield, of Penistone, Yorkshire; and Messrs. Smith & Burdakin, of Sheffield.

William Henry Fellows, aged 23, who served his clerkship to Messrs. Coldicutt & Canning, of Dudley; and Messrs. Combe & Wainwright, of London.

Robert Rogers Nelson, aged 22, who served his clerkship to Messrs. P. & W. B. Nelson, of London.

Marcus Samuel Cam Rickards, aged 22, who served his clerkship to Messrs. Cooke, of Bristol; and Mr. Joseph Woodcock of London.

Charles Rickards Steward, aged 21, who served his clerkship to Mr. Charles Steward, of Ipswich, and Messrs. W. and H. P. Sharp, of London.

The Council have accordingly awarded them certificates of merit.

The examiners have further announced to the following candidates that their answers to the questions at the examination were highly satisfactory, and would have entitled them to prizes or certificates of merit if they had been under the age of 26:—

Henry Letts, aged 35, who served his clerkship to Messrs. Clowes, Hickley, & Deary, of London.

William Manby, aged 29, who served his clerkship to Mr. William Andrew, of Lincoln.

John Watson, aged 31, who served his clerkship to Mr. Christopher Thornton Clark, of Lancaster; and Messrs. Johnson & Weatheralls, of London.

Henry Ikin, aged 30, who served his clerkship to Mr. Harry James Davis, of Leicester; Mr. Thomas Ingram, of Leicester; and Messrs. Coverdale, Lee & Collyer-Bristows, of London.

Thomas Whatley, aged 27, who served his clerkship to Mr. George Lawson Whatley, of Mitchel Dean.

Frederic Charles Nightingale, B.A., aged 26, who served his clerkship to Messrs. Currie & Williams, of London.

The number of candidates examined in this term was 121; of these, 107 were passed, and 14 postponed.

PRELIMINARY EXAMINATIONS BEFORE ENTERING INTO ARTICLES OF CLERKSHIP TO ATTORNEYS AND SOLICITORS.

The special examiners appointed by the judges, by an Order dated the 26th of November, 1861, have selected the following parts of books, in which the examinations will take place at the examination on the 12th and 13th of August, 1862:—

In Latin.—Cicero's Oration against Cataline; or Horace's Odes (Books II. and III.).

In Greek.—Demosthenes, Olinthiacs and Philippics; or Homer's Odyssey (Books I. to III.).

In modern Greek: Βικκαρίον, περί 'Αδίκημάτων καὶ Ποινῶν μεταφραστικὸν ἐκ τῆς Ἰταλικῆς Γλώσσης; or Βεντοτῆ Ἱστορία τῆς Ἀμερικής.

In French.—Racine's Britannicus; or Molière's Le Bourgeois Gentilhomme.

In German.—Lessing's Emilia Galotti; or Tieck's Kaiser Octavianus, Zweiter Theil (Acts 1 and 2).

In Spanish.—Cervantes' Don Quixote; or Dom Hartzembuch's La Coja y el Encogido.

In Italian.—Manzoni's Promessi Sposi; or Tasso's Gerusalemme Liberata.

Each candidate will be examined in *one only* of the languages and *one only* of the two works above mentioned.

All notices and inquiries should be addressed to the Secretary of the Incorporated Law Society, Chancery-lane, W.C.

CANDIDATES WHO PASSED THE EXAMINATION.

TRINITY TERM, 1862.

Name of Candidate.	To whom articulated, assigned, &c.
Abbey, James Thomas . . .	Henry Cook.
Abraham, Robert James . . .	William Augustus Geare.
Ansell, Joseph, jun.	William Docker.
Atkinson, Joshua S. Hitchcock . . .	Matthew Bateson Wood.
Barclay, Joseph, jun	Thomas Cooper.
Barling, John Rawlinson, B.A. . . .	W. H. Heelis; W. Slater.
Batt Bertram	John Ayre, jun.
Bayley, Fras. Souper	John James.
Bellringer, Thomas	Frederick Copley Hulston.
Beason, John	R. Benson; William Moorclaff.
Birkett, Benjamin	Wiles & Chapman
Blaker, Montague Spencer, B.A.	Edgar Blaker.
Bramble, James Roger	James George Hobbs.
Brown, Frederick James	C. F. Gale; T. G. Norcutt.
Buckton, John George	James Buckton.
Burgin, Joseph	Edward Lambert.
Carew, Henry George	Edward Thomas Whitaker.
Champion, Frederick Shepherd . . .	Charles Champion.
Chaplin, Holroyd	Henry Elland Norton.
Clark, George D'Arcy	W. Keary; E. L. Rowcliffe.
Clark, James Briggs	Henry Aston, deceased.
Clarke, Spencer	Thomas Lamb.
Cooper, William Edward	E. Y. Cooper; G. Goldney.
Cronin, Alfred Charles	Frederick Maples.
Crook, William	Frederick John Cox.
Davies, R. Edmund Elkins	Attwood & Brown.
Davies, William Henry, B.A. . . .	Henry Davies.
Dennis, George Whitwell	W. Overell; J. Kingsford.
Dickson, Patrick Thorp	William Dickson.
Dransfield, John Ness	J. Dransfield; B. Burdekin, jun.
Dunn, Hugh	John Shields Peacock.
Edger, Robert	Thomas Belk.
Ellis, Lloyd	D. Hughes; William Stevens.
Fallows, William Edward	William Cottrell.
Fellows, William Henry	Henry Coldicutt.
Feltham, Henry	James Feltham.
GreatRex, Frederick	John William Butterson.
Hancock, Charles Robert	John Stone.
Hayward, John, B.A.	Frederick Hayward.
Heathcote, Thornhill Bradford . . .	Gerard Coke Meynell.
Hill, John Jowitt	John Watson.
Hill, Joseph Prosser	Henry Hill.
Holt, Edmund	William Holt.
Holby, Robert	John Holby.
Hughes, Owen Davies	W. B. Williams, deceased; W. Williams.
Humphreys, Henry	T. Hughes; J. Urquhart.
Ikin, Henry	H. J. Davis; T. Ingram.
Inman, William Samuel	William Hope Heelis.
Irving, William John	Christopher Fairer.
Jennings, Francis Barnard	R. F. Jennings, deceased; A. B. Champ.
Lamb, Samuel Blackman, jun. . . .	Samuel Blackman Lamb.
Letts, Henry	Thomas Allen Hickley.
Lucas, James	John Henry Todd.
Luckett, Horatio	William Hugh Dennett.
Manby, William	William Andrew.
Metcalf, William Marwood	Thomas Whalley Bolton.
Monckton, Herbert	John Braddick Monckton.

Name of Candidate.	To whom articulated, assigned, &c.
Morgan, William	R. William Hand.
Morris, John	Richard Wyndham Williams.
Morris, William	John George Holden.
Mottram, Henry Goddard	Robert Henry Whitcombe.
Mumford, George	William Dowman.
Nelson, Robert Rogers	Park Nelson.
Nelson, Thomas Boone	T. W. Nelson.
Nightingale, F. Charles, B.A. . . .	James Currie; W. Williams.
Norton, William Henry	Thurston George Dale.
Oldham, Charles	T. Nicks, deceased; George C. Greenway.
Owen, Owen	William Lucas.
Parker, Francis	Richard Higgins Burne.
Parker, Stamford Perrott	T. P. Peterson; W. B. Parker.
Parker, William Edward	C. L. Coward; T. J. Newman.
Paul, Albert St., M.A.	Charles John C. Pritchard.
Pearce, James Horne	James Pearce.
Perry, Arthur	Philip P. Smith.
Perry, William	P. P. Smith.
Price, George	Henry Christian.
Reece, Edmund Bernard	Richard Lewis Reece.
Rickards, Marcus Samuel Cam . . .	George Cook.
Roberts, Edward Francis	Samuel Johnson Roberts.
Rogerson, George Russell	Thomas Rogerson.
Ryland, Henry Skipper	Joseph Woodcock.
Sale, William George	James Roberts; W. Sale.
Scratcherd, Oliver	Thomas Taylor.
Sedgefield, Walter James	J. B. Sedgefield; J. Baker.
Shearm, Edward	James Frederick Delmar.
Shelley, John	Alfred Rooker.
Stephenson, Glanville, B.A.	Edward Simon Stephenson.
Stewart, Charles Richards	Charles Steward.
Stratton, Undecimus, jun.	James Walker.
Strother, William	Thomas Strother.
Stubbs, Robert Lidgard	T. J. Stubbs; R. G. Hilleary.
Thomas, David William Jones . . .	David Thomas.
Toy, James	Merlin Fryer.
Trinder, Henry William	W. H. Trinder; W. Flower.
Turner, Tom	J. B. Robinson; A. O. Atkinson, M.A.
Vulliamy, Arthur Frederick	Charles Steward.
Ward, Richard	Robert Marriott.
Watson, John	Christopher Thornton Clark.
Webster, Henry	Thomas Price.
Whitley, Thomas	George Lawson Whitley.
Wilding, John	Richard Wilding.
Wilson, Caleb Fisher	Joseph Hall; H. J. Halton; Robert Broatch.
Winbolt, Henry Holt	Edward Bannister.
Wise, George	Benjamin S. Simpson.
Wood, Henry Francis	John Taylor; Henry Roscoe.
Woodgate, Sidney William	William Woodgate.
Woodhead, Edwin	William Marratt.

Public Companies.

BILLS IN PARLIAMENT

FOR THE FORMATION OF NEW LINES OF RAILWAY IN ENGLAND AND WALES.

The following Bills have been read a third time in the House of Commons and passed:—

BRECON AND MERTHYR TYDFIL JUNCTION.
CANNOCK CHAS (EXTENSION).
EASTERN COUNTIES (EPPING LINES).
KENT COAST.
KETTERING AND THRAPSTONE.
MERTHYR, TREDEGAR AND ABERGAVENNY.

General Orders.

CHANCERY.

June 13.

SUGGESTIONS AND INSTRUCTIONS BY THE CLERKS OF RECORDS AND WRITS OF THE COURT OF CHANCERY AS TO AFFIDAVITS, to be printed pursuant to the General Orders of the 16th day of May, 1862.

In order to facilitate the transaction of business, under the

General Orders of the Court, dated 16th May, 1862, the following suggestions and instructions are submitted by the Clerks of Records and Writs to the Solicitors of the Court, with the sanction and approval of the Master of the Rolls.

I.

The provisions of the before-mentioned General Orders apply only to evidence taken *after* issue joined, or filed on or *after* service of notice of motion for a decree—and to be used on the hearing of the cause.

II.

It is desirable that the affidavits to be thus used in any cause be all presented for filing together at one time, and, if possible, on the last day of the time allowed for filing the same—that is to say, where issue has been joined, on the last day of the time fixed for closing the evidence, and, where notice of motion for a decree has been served, on the last day of each of the respective times allowed to the plaintiff and defendant for filing the affidavits—and that the fair copies left with such affidavits be numbered consecutively (at the top of the first page) in the order in which it is desired that they should be printed.

III.

In cases where the preceding suggestion is complied with, the application to have the evidence printed may be made at the time the evidence is filed.

IV.

The application to have any evidence taken orally printed may be made at any time after such evidence is filed,—except that in cases where a time for taking any oral examination has been specially fixed, and also in cases where issue has been joined, the application is not to be made until the time fixed for taking the examination, or for closing the evidence, has expired.

V.

It is desirable that the number of printed copies of the evidence which may be required for general use in the cause be stated on the form of application to have the evidence printed.

VI.

As a rule, the printed copy required to be taken under Rule VI. of the General Orders will be ready for delivery within forty-eight hours after the application to have the evidence printed is made. There may be exceptional cases as to which longer time for printing may be required.

The other copies, obtainable under Rule VII., may be had at the same time as the official copy.

VII.

The fair copy required to be left by the solicitor, under Rule III., is to be written on draft paper, on *one side only*, with the usual margin on the left hand side of each page.

VIII.

The certificate as to the correctness of the fair copy is to be written on the left hand margin of the *first* page of each such copy.

To prevent delay, it is requested that the certificate be written upon the copy or copies before being brought to the office.

IX.

* Printed copies of the form of application to have the evidence printed (Form No. I.), may be had on application at the divisional seats in the Record and Writ Clerks' Office.

Court Papers.

Circuits of the Judges, 1862.

WILLES, J., will remain in town.

NORFOLK.

COCKBURN, L.C.J., and WIGHTMAN, J.

Aylesbury, Tuesday, July 15.	Norwich and City, Saturday, July 26.
Bedford, Friday, July 18.	Ipswich, Thursday, July 31.
Huntingdon, Monday, July 21.	
Cambridge, Wednesday, July 23.	

* In cases where any of the affidavits have been taken before a commissioner, and the solicitor has reason to doubt compliance on the part of such commissioner with the usual formalities, such affidavits may, if desired, be presented for examination previously to the day on which it may be intended to file the same.

† A form is appended.

MIDLAND.

ERLE, L.C.J., and POLLOCK, L.C.B.

Northampton, Wed., July 16.	Lincoln, Saturday, July 26.
Oakham and Leicester, Saturday, July 19.	Derby, Saturday, Aug. 2.
Nottingham, Wed., July 23.	Warwick, Thursday, Aug. 7.

WESTERN.

WILLIAMS, J., and KEATING, J.

Winchester, Monday, July 14.	Bodmin, Saturday, Aug. 2.
Salisbury, Saturday, July 19.	Wells, Thursday, Aug. 7.
Dorchester, Wednesday, July 23.	Bristol, Wednesday, Aug. 13.
Exeter & City, Saturday, July 26.	

HOME.

MARTIN, B., and BRAMWELL, B.

Hertford, Tuesday, July 15.	Lewes, Friday, Aug. 1.
Chelmsford, Monday, July 21.	Guildford, Wednesday, Aug. 6.
Maidstone, Friday, July 25.	

NORTH WALES.

CRAMPTON, J.

Newtown, Tuesday, July 15.	Ruthin, Monday, July 28.
Dolgelly, Friday, July 18.	Mold, Thursday, July 31.
Carnarvon, Monday, July 21.	Chester and City, Saturday, Aug. 2.
Beaumaris, Thursday, July 24.	

SOUTH WALES.

CHANNELL, B.

Haverfordwest and Town, Thursday, July 3.	Cardiff, Tuesday, July 15.
Cardigan, Monday, July 7.	Brecon, Friday, July 25.
Carmarthen, Thursday, July 10.	Presteign, Thursday, July 31.
	Chester & City, Saturday, Aug. 2.

OXFORD.

BYLES, J., and BLACKBURN, J.

Abingdon, Thursday, July 10.	Shrewsbury, Friday, Aug. 1.
Oxford, Saturday, July 12.	Hereford, Tuesday, Aug. 5.
Worcester and City, Wednesday, July 16.	Monmouth, Thursday, Aug. 7.
Stafford, Monday, July 21.	Gloucester and City, Tuesday, Aug. 12.

NORTHERN.

WILDE, B., and MELLOR, J.

York, Saturday, July 12.	Carlisle, Wednesday, Aug. 6.
Durham, Saturday, July 26.	Appleby, Saturday, Aug. 9.
Newcastle and Town, Friday, Aug. 1.	Lancaster, Monday, Aug. 11.
	Liverpool, Thursday, Aug. 14.

Common Pleas.

This Court will, on Saturday, the 21st, Thursday, the 26th, Friday, the 27th, and Saturday, the 28th, days of June, inst., hold sittings in banco, and will proceed with the cases standing in the new trial and in the special paper of this court. And this Court will also hold a sitting in banco on Saturday, the 12th day of July next, to give judgment in the cases that will be standing over for the consideration of the Court.

Exchequer of Pleas.

This Court will hold sittings on Wednesday the 25th, Thursday the 26th, Friday the 27th, and Saturday the 28th days of June instant, and will at such sittings proceed in disposing of the business then pending in the paper of new trials and in the special paper, and in giving judgment in matters then standing for judgment.

Court of Chancery.

SITTINGS AFTER TRINITY TERM, 1862.

LORD CHANCELLOR.

Lincoln's Inn.

Tuesday, June 24	{ The First Seal.—
Wednesday 25	{ App. mtns. & apps.
Thursday 26	{ Petns. & appeals.
Friday 27	{ Appeals.
Saturday 28	{ Appeals.
Monday 29	{ Appeals.
Tuesday July 1	{ The Second Seal.—
Wednesday 2	{ App. mtns. & apps.
Thursday 3	{ Appeals.
Friday 4	{ Appeals.
Saturday 5	{ Appeals.
Monday 6	{ Appeals.
Tuesday 7	{ Appeals.
Wednesday 8	{ Appeals.
Thursday 9	{ Appeals.

Thursday .. 10	{ The Third Seal.—
Friday .. 11	{ App. mtns. & apps.
Saturday .. 12	{ Appeals.
Monday .. 13	{ Appeals.
Tuesday .. 14	{ Appeals.
Wednesday 15	{ The Fourth Seal.—
Thursday 16	{ App. mtns. & apps.
Friday .. 17	{ Appeals.
Saturday .. 18	{ Petitions and apps.
Monday .. 19	{ Appeals.
Tuesday .. 20	{ Appeals.
Wednesday 21	{ Appeals.
Thursday 22	{ The Fifth Seal.—
Friday 23	{ App. mtns. & apps.

NOTICE.—The days (if any) on which the Lord Chancellor shall be en-

gaged in the House of Lords are excepted.

MASTER OF THE ROLLS. Chancery-lane.

Tuesday, June 24	The First Seal.— Mtns. & gen. pa.
Wednesday .. 25	
Thursday .. 26	General paper.
Friday .. 27	
Saturday .. 28	Petns., sht. caus., adj. sums, and general paper.
Monday .. 30	General paper.
Tuesday July 1	
Wednesday .. 2	The Second Seal.— Mtns. & gen. pa.
Thursday .. 3	
Friday .. 4	General paper.
Saturday .. 5	Petns., sht. caus., adj. sums, and general paper.
Monday .. 7	General paper.
Tuesday .. 8	
Wednesday .. 9	
Thursday .. 10	The Third Seal.— Mtns. & gen. pa.
Friday .. 11	General paper.
Saturday .. 12	Petns., sht. caus., adj. sums, and general paper.
Monday .. 14	General paper.
Tuesday .. 15	
Wednesday .. 16	
Thursday .. 17	The Fourth Seal.— Mtns. & gen. pa.
Friday .. 18	General paper.
Saturday .. 19	Petns., sht. caus., adj. sums, and general paper.
Monday .. 21	Remaining petns. and general paper.
Tuesday .. 22	
Wednesday .. 23	The Fifth Seal.— Motions.
Thursday .. 24	

* At the sittings after Trinity Term, the Master of the Rolls will hear further considerations in priority to original causes, until those set down before the 24th of June have been disposed of, after which the Master of the Rolls will hear further considerations on every Monday during the sitting of the Court.

N.B.—Unopposed petitions must be presented and copies left with the Secretary, on or before the Thursday preceding the Saturday on which it is intended they should be heard; and any causes intended to be heard as short causes must be so marked at least one clear day before the same can be put in the paper to be so heard.

LORDS JUSTICES. Lincoln's Inn.

Tuesday, June 24	The First Seal.— App. mtns. & apps.
Wednesday .. 25	Appeals.
Thursday .. 26	
Friday .. 27	Petns. in luncy, app. ptns., bank- rupt apps., & apps.
Saturday .. 28	
Monday .. 30	Appeals.
Tuesday July 1	
Wednesday .. 2	
Thursday .. 3	The Second Seal.— App. mtns. & apps. Petns. in luncy, app. ptns., bank- rupt apps., & apps.
Friday .. 4	
Saturday .. 5	
Monday .. 7	Appeals.
Tuesday .. 8	
Wednesday .. 9	
Thursday .. 10	The Third Seal.— App. mtns. & apps. Petns. in luncy, app. ptns., bank- rupt apps., & apps.
Friday .. 11	
Saturday .. 12	
Monday .. 14	Appeals.
Tuesday .. 15	
Wednesday .. 16	
Thursday .. 17	The Fourth Seal.— App. mtns. & apps. Petns. in luncy, app. ptns., bank- rupt apps., & apps.
Friday .. 18	
Saturday .. 19	
Monday .. 21	Appeals.
Tuesday .. 22	
Wednesday .. 23	
Thursday .. 24	The Fifth Seal.— App. mtns. & apps.

Notice.—The days (if any) on which the Lords Justices shall be engaged in the Full Court, or at the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, are excepted.

V. C. Sir R. T. KINDERSLEY. Lincoln's Inn.

Tuesday, June 24	The First Seal.— Mtns., adj. sums, & general paper.
Wednesday .. 25	General paper.
Thursday .. 26	
Friday .. 27	Ptns. & gen. pa.
Saturday .. 28	Sht. causes, adj. sums, & gen. pa.
Monday .. 30	General paper.
Tuesday July 1	
Wednesday .. 2	
Thursday .. 3	The Second Seal.— Mtns., adj. sums, & gen. pa.
Friday .. 4	Ptns. & gen. pa.
Saturday .. 5	Sht. causes, adj. sums, & gen. pa.
Monday .. 7	General paper.
Tuesday .. 8	
Wednesday .. 9	
Thursday .. 10	The Third Seal.— Mtns., adj. sums, & gen. pa.
Friday .. 11	Ptns. & gen. pa.
Saturday .. 12	Sht. causes, adj. sums, & gen. pa.
Monday .. 14	General paper.
Tuesday .. 15	
Wednesday .. 16	
Thursday .. 17	The Fourth Seal.— Mtns., adj. sums, & gen. pa.
Friday .. 18	Ptns. & gen. pa.
Saturday .. 19	Sht. causes, adj. sums, & rem. ptns.
Monday .. 21	Remaining petns. and general paper.
Tuesday .. 22	
Wednesday .. 23	
Thursday .. 24	The Fifth Seal.— Motions.

N.B.—At the sittings after Trinity Term, the Vice-Chancellor will hear further considerations in priority to original causes. Any causes intended to be heard as short causes must be so marked at least one clear day before the same can be put in the paper to be so heard.

V. C. Sir JOHN STUART. Lincoln's Inn.

Tuesday, June 24	The First Seal.— Mtns., causes, &c.
Wednesday .. 25	Causes, &c.
Thursday .. 26	
Friday .. 27	Ptns., causes, &c.
Saturday .. 28	Sht. caus. caus., &c.
Monday .. 30	Causes, &c.
Tuesday July 1	
Wednesday .. 2	
Thursday .. 3	The Second Seal.— Mtns., causes, &c.
Friday .. 4	Ptns., causes, &c.
Saturday .. 5	Sht. caus. caus., &c.
Monday .. 7	Causes, &c.
Tuesday .. 8	
Wednesday .. 9	
Thursday .. 10	The Third Seal.— Mtns., causes, &c.
Friday .. 11	Ptns., causes, &c.
Saturday .. 12	Sht. caus. caus., &c.
Monday .. 14	Causes, &c.
Tuesday .. 15	
Wednesday .. 16	
Thursday .. 17	The Fourth Seal.— Mtns., causes, &c.
Friday .. 18	Ptns., causes, &c.
Saturday .. 19	Sht. caus. & causes
Monday .. 21	Causes.
Tuesday .. 22	
Wednesday .. 23	The Fifth Seal.— Motions.
Thursday .. 24	

N.B.—At the sittings after Trinity Term, the Vice-Chancellor will hear further considerations in priority to original causes. Any causes intended to be heard as short causes must be so marked, at least one clear day before the same can be put in the paper to be so heard.

No Cause, Motion for Decree, or Further Consideration shall, except by Order of the Court, be marked to stand over, if it shall be within 13 of the last Cause or Matter in the printed Paper of the day for hearing.

V. C. Sir W. P. WOOD. Lincoln's Inn.

Tuesday, June 24	The First Seal.— Mtns. & gen. pa.
Wednesday .. 25	
Thursday .. 26	General paper.
Friday .. 27	
Saturday .. 28	Ptns., sht. causes, & general paper.
Monday .. 30	General paper.
Tuesday July 1	
Wednesday .. 2	
Thursday .. 3	The Second Seal.— Mtns. & gen. pa.
Friday .. 4	General paper.
Saturday .. 5	Ptns., sht. causes, & general paper.
Monday .. 7	General paper.
Tuesday .. 8	
Wednesday .. 9	
Thursday .. 10	The Third Seal.— Mtns. & gen. pa.
Friday .. 11	General paper.
Saturday .. 12	Ptns. sht. causes, & general paper.

Monday .. 14	General paper.
Tuesday .. 15	
Wednesday .. 16	
Thursday .. 17	The Fourth Seal.— Mtns. & gen. pa.
Friday .. 18	General paper.
Saturday .. 19	Ptns. & sht. caus.
Monday .. 21	Remaining petns. and general paper.
Tuesday .. 22	
Wednesday .. 23	
Thursday .. 24	The Fifth Seal.— Motions.

N.B.—At these sittings the Vice-Chancellor will hear such further considerations as are in the printed list in priority to original causes, and after the fifth seal, motions and remaining petitions only will be heard. Any causes intended to be heard as short causes must be so marked at least one clear day before the same can be put in the paper to be so heard. The Courts will not sit after Tuesday, the 5th of August.

Births, Marriages, and Deaths.

BIRTH.

CURREY—On June 16, at Sketty, near Swansea, the wife of Arthur Currey, Esq., Barrister-at-Law, of a son.

MARRIAGES.

ALCOCK—PALMER—On June 11, Samuel Alcock, Esq., Jun., Solicitor, third son of Samuel Alcock, Esq., J.P., to Jane Palmer, niece of Wm. Snowball, Esq., Solicitor and Town Clerk of Sunderland.

HALCOMBE—BARBER—On June 14, the Rev. Joseph Halcombe, Esq., M.A., Reader and Librarian at Charter House, third son of the late Mr. Serjeant Halcombe, Esq., to Emily Mary, youngest daughter of Captain Barber, Esq., of Merton Abbey, Surrey.

HOLROYD—COMPTON—On April 19, Edward Dundas Holroyd, Esq., M.A., of Melbourne, Barrister-at-Law, second son of Edward Holroyd, Esq., of Wimbledon, Surrey, to Anna Maria Hoynes Compton, youngest daughter of Henry Compton, Esq., late of Totnes, Devonshire.

HOSKINS—COMPIGNE—On June 11, Thomas, son of the late Thomas Hoskins, Esq., of Gosport, to Louisa, eldest daughter of Horatio Compigne, Esq., of the same place.

MUNBY—LATIMER—On June 11, Frederick J. Munby Esq., of Manchester, Solicitor, fourth son of Joseph Munby, Esq., of Clifton Holme, York, to Elizabeth Jane, only daughter of the late David Latimer, Esq., of Sangh Heads, Cumberland.

WOOD—YOUNG—On June 12, Thomas Pattison Wood, Esq., Captain in her Majesty's 29th Foot, to Maria Frances Jane, only daughter of the late George Renney Young, Esq., Barrister-at-Law.

DEATHS.

KNIGHT—On June 9, at Stafford, Edward Knight, Esq., M.B., Cantab., Magistrate and Deputy Lieutenant for the County of Stafford, in his 82nd year.

LETITIA—On June 16, Frances Letitia, the wife of William Knight, Esq., Solicitor, Tamworth, daughter of the late Philip Williams, Esq., of Rugby.

London Gazettes.

Windings-up of Joint Stock Companies.

FRIDAY, June 13, 1862.

UNLIMITED IN CHANCERY.

North Wheal Exmouth Mining Company.—Creditors to prove their debts before the Master of the Rolls forthwith. Monday, June 30 at 12 appointed for adjudicating upon claims.

Tretoli and Messer Mining Company.—Creditors to prove their debts before V. C. Wood forthwith. June 24 at 1 appointed for adjudicating upon claims.

TUESDAY, June 17, 1862.

UNLIMITED IN CHANCERY.

English and Irish Church and University Assurance Society.—V.C. Wood will proceed, on June 28 at 2, to settle the list of contributories of this company.

Home Counties and General Life Assurance Company.—V.C. Kindersley will, on Thursday, June 26, at 1, make a call on the contributories for 6s. 6d. per share, in respect of £1 shares, and for 13s. per share, in respect of £2 shares.

Life Assurance Treasury.—V.C. Wood has peremptorily ordered a call of 18s. per share on all contributories, to be paid, on June 23, to R. F. Harding, Official Manager, 3 Bank-buildings.

Creditors under 22 & 23 Vict. cap. 35.

Last Day of Claim.

FRIDAY, June 13, 1862.

Beynon, David, Springfield, Liverpool, Builder. Aug. 1. Sol Jones, Liverpool.

Bonner, Elizabeth, Bensington, Oxfordshire, Widow. July 31. Sols J & C. Hodges, Wallingford.

Bonner, Richard, formerly of Berwick Salomoe, and late of Bensington, Oxfordshire, Farmer. July 31. Sols J & C. Hodges, Wallingford.

Davies, Joseph, Holland-pl, Kensington, Wine Merchant. July 17. Sol Jennings, 12 New Bowell-st, Lincoln's Inn.

Elmslie, William, 23 York-st, Portman-sq, Middlesex, Esq. July 12. Sol Forsyth, 10 Lombard-st.
 Harris, John, Jun, Monkton, Glamorganshire, Farmer, July 12. Sol Vesely & Middleton, Bridgend.
 Harrison, Frances Elizabeth, Mount Pleasant, Marsden, Lancashire, Widow. Aug 1. Sols Shaw & Co, Burnley.
 Howell, Willoughby Wintle, late Second Lieutenant of Her Majesty's Ship Jason. Aug 11. Sols M. & F. Davidson, 18 Spring-gardens.
 Mack, James, 27 Regent-rd, Liverpool, Licensed Victualler. July 12. Sol Tyrer, Liverpool.
 Morgan, Morgan, Bodwiglad, Penderyn, Brecon, Esq. July 25. Sol Williams, Cardiff.
 Perry, Richard, formerly of Lincoln's Inn, and late of 18 Chester-ter, Regent's-pk, Esq. Aug 12. Sol Lucas, 50 Fenchurch-st.
 Turner, Henry Augustus, Nuneaton, Gent. July 31. Sols Harris & Moe, Bishopsgate-church-yd.
 Were, William, 2 Brixtonville, Brixton, and 44 Botolph-lane, London, Provision Merchant. July 28. J. G. Hooton, 6 Cannon-st, and A. H. Penny, 16 Cannon-st West, Executors.

TUESDAY, June 17, 1862.

Dixon, Mary, Catwick, Holderness, Yorkshire, Widow. July 21. Sol Park, Hedon, Holderness.
 Farror, Thomas, Monmouth, Printer. July 12. Sol Nicholas, Monmouth.
 Fillingham, John Joseph Ashby, 8 Hanover-st, Walworth, Gent. Aug 2. Sols Taylor, Hoare, & Taylor, 28 Great James-st, Bedford-row.
 Llewellyn, Ann, formerly of 8 Grove-lane, Camberwell, and late of 5 Camberwell-grove, Widow. Aug 18. Sols Woollaston & Davison, 77 Basing-hall-st.
 Mason, Christopher Thomas, Chelmsford, Gent. Sept 5. Sols Gepp & Veley, Chelmsford.
 Wood, Amelia, St George's-place, Canterbury, Widow. Aug 18. Sols Wightwick & Co, Canterbury.

Creditors under Estates in Chancery.

Last Day of Proof.

FRIDAY, June 13, 1862.

Beale, Thomas, Woodknowle, Burwash, Sussex, Gent. July 9. Adams v. Williams; Crisp v. Williams, V. C. Stuart.
 Blogg, Ashton, Ipswich, Brewer. July 10. Angier v. Blogg, V. C. Stuart.
 Corbett, Thomas, Birmingham, Plumber. July 1. Corbett v. Glazebrook, M. R.
 Pascoe, John, Blyth House, Lewisham, and 50 Threadneedle-st, Mine Owner. July 22. Norvall v. Pascoe; Thomas v. Pascoe, V. C. Kindersley.
 Restall, Henry, 261 City-rd, Commercial Clerk. July 12. Sweeting v. Whitebread, V. C. Stuart.
 Tattersall, William, formerly of Burnley, Lancashire, but late of Haberg-ham Eaves, near Burnley, Cotton Waste Dealer. July 14. Whittaker v. Dixon, V. C. Stuart.
 Wilson, Elizabeth, Sackville-st, Piccadilly, Widow. June 30. Colls v. Robins, V. C. Stuart.
 Wilson, Sarah, Sherburn, Yorkshire, Spinster. July 10. Wilson v. Miller, M. R.

TUESDAY, June 17, 1862.

Clark, William, Waltham-croas, Essex, Barge Master. July 9. Clark v. Clark, V. C. Stuart.
 Conway, John, 2 Cambridge-ter, Cambridge-heath, Middlesex, Gent. July 10. Woodson v. Conway, M. R.
 Godley, John Robert, Gloucester-pl, Portland-sq, Esq. July 18. Godley v. Godley, M. R.
 Horton, Elizabeth, 39 Green-pk-bldgs, Bath. July 17. Edington v. Sloper, V. C. Stuart.
 Jackson, Emma Margaret, Greenwich, Widow, Cornfactor. July 9. Jackson v. Brown, M. R.
 Meyrick, James, 8 Bucklersbury, London, and 93 Victoria-rd, Islington, Surveyor. July 31. Harrington v. Meyrick, V. C. Stuart.
 Murcott, Thomas, Hincley, Leicestershire, Hosier. July 9. Murcott v. Marcott, M. R.
 Ranken, Elizabeth Mary, 29 Finchley-new-rd, Middlesex, Widow. July 11. Bull v. Jones, V. C. Kindersley.
 Stainton, William, Kendall, Innkeeper. July 11. Stainton v. Stainton, M. R.

Assignments for Benefit of Creditors.

FRIDAY, June 13, 1862.

Ballinger, Joseph Davis, Liverpool, Grocer. June 10. Sol Henry, Liverpool.
 Bellamy, William, Oundle, Grocer. June 10. Sols Treherne & Wolfertan, 17 Gresham-st.
 Parker, Thomas, Tonbridge, Farmer. May 14. Sols Few & Cole, 40 Wellington-st, Southwark.
 Woodhead, Charles, Olilton, Notts, Grocer. May 14. Sol Camp, 12 Paternoster-row.

TUESDAY, June 17, 1862.

Brunton, Robert, Weasenham, Norfolk, Blacksmith. May 19. Sol Sadd, Norwich.

Deeds registered pursuant to Bankruptcy Act, 1861.

FRIDAY, June 13, 1862.

Ashe, John, Stockport, Spinner. June 10. Composition. Reg June 13.
 Banks, Margaret, Fazakerley-st, Chorley, Lancashire, Hosier. May 16. Assignment. Reg June 13.
 Barra, Thomas, Salop-st, Wolverhampton, Maister. May 31. Assignment. Reg June 12.
 Bellamy, William, Oundle, Grocer. June 10. Assignment. Reg June 13.
 Cooper, Thomas, Northampton, Cab Proprietor. May 26. Assignment. Reg June 11.
 Coxon, Jesse, Birmingham, Retail Brewer. June 2. Assignment. Reg June 11.
 Edwards, James Henry, Hayle, Cornwall, Grocer. May 15. Conveyance. Reg June 12.
 Furbank, William, Castlegate, Yorkshire, Grocer. May 14. Assignment. Reg June 11.

Glentworth, George, Infirmary-rd, Sheffield, Builder. May 15. Assignment. Reg June 11.
 Griffin, Jane, 26 Great Hampton-st, Birmingham, Draper. June 2. Assignment. Reg June 11.
 Hawdon, William George, Jun, & Michael Hawdon, Blaydon, Durham, Iron Founders. May 17. Assignment. Reg June 12.
 Harwood, Josiah, Stockport, Accountant. May 23. Arrangement. Reg June 13.
 Isaacs, Israel, Duke-st, Aldgate, London, Cap-peak Maker. May 26. Assignment. Reg June 12.
 Marsh, George, Verandah-cottage, Bath-rd, Peckham, Surrey, Builder. May 27. Conveyance. Reg June 11.
 Millwater, George, & Frederick Greenway, Diglis, Worcester, Grocers. May 26. Composition. Reg June 11.
 Parker, Thomas, Tonbridge, Farmer. May 14. Assignment. Reg June 11.
 Pearson, Francis, Birmingham, Woollen Draper. May 23. Composition. Reg June 13.
 Richards, John Lawrie, 28 Parliament-st, Westminster, Engineer. May 19. Composition. Reg June 12.
 Simms, Samuel, Lion Tavern, Hill-sides, Clifton-wood, Bristol, Beer Retailer. May 22. Conveyance. Reg June 11.
 Steinberg, Otto Radolph Julius, & Frederik Alexander Anne Abern, 37 and 38 Mark-lane, London, General Commission Merchants (Steinberg & Abern). June 14. Assignment. Reg June 9.
 Sutton, Abraham, Swansdale, Tailor. May 28. Assignment. Reg June 12.
 Vickers, Edward, New-st, Wednesfield, Wolverhampton, Carrier. June 4. Assignment. Reg June 12.
 Wilby, William, Openshaw, Lancashire, Tanner. June 10. Composition. Reg June 12.

TUESDAY, June 17, 1862.

Bello, Sterio Demetrio, Giovanni Michele Riso, Anastasio Constantino Riso, Isacco Mordochio Tiano, & Diamanti Demetrio Bello, Constantinople, London, and Manchester (S. D. Bello & Co). Jan. Assignment. Reg June 14.
 Bush, John, 2 Bowley-cottages, Kingsland-rd, Publican. May 22. Composition. Reg June 16.
 Castleton, Elijah, Stoke Holy Cross, Norfolk, Farmer. June 9. Assignment. Reg June 16.
 Cook, Richard, South-st, Exeter, Druggist. May 20. Assignment. Reg June 16.
 Dickinson, Henry, West Malling, Brewer. May 29. Assignment. Reg June 16.
 Guest, Thomas, Coalbourn-brook, near Stourbridge, Rope Maker. May 27. Composition. Reg June 13.
 Johnston, William, Birmingham, Draper. May 16. Assignment. Reg June 13.
 Jones, Thomas, 34 Islington-rd, Birmingham, Tailor. June 1. Inspectorship. Reg June 13.
 Keene, Francis Edwin, 31 Berkeley-villas, Loughborough-pk, Brixton, Sheriff's Officer. June 12. Composition. Reg June 17.
 Landsberger, Sigismund, 3 Fenchurch-bldgs, Fenchurch-st, London, Commission Agent. June 10. Conveyance. Reg June 16.
 Leonard, Henry, 22 High-st, Bristol, Ironmonger. May 26. Conveyance. Reg June 17.
 Miller, John, Sheffield, Paper Hanger. May 21. Assignment. Reg June 16.
 Porter, Ambrose, East Challow, Berks, Innkeeper. May 13. Composition. Reg June 16.
 Ruek, John, Duke-st, London-bridge, Cheesemonger. May 19. Composition. Reg June 16.
 Smith, Joseph, 22 Gloucester-ter, New-rd, Whitechapel East, Middlesex, Draper. May 29. Assignment. Reg June 16.
 Thin, Robert, & William Heddle Flett, Liverpool, Merchants. May 21. Conveyance. Reg June 16.
 Vivian, John Robins, 9 George-st, Asylum-rd, Old Kent-rd, Surrey, Coal Agent. May 26. Composition. Reg June 14.
 Ward, Margaret, 47 Villiers-st, Sunderland. May 22. Assignment. Reg June 16.
 Williams, Charles Watts, Townwall-st, Dover, Grocer. May 29. Composition. Reg June 13.
 Winkle, Henry, Baldwin-st, Bristol, Fishmonger. June 9. Composition. Reg June 16.

Bankrupts.

FRIDAY, June 13, 1862.

Bacon, Henry James, Sun-st, Hitchin, Herts, Upholsterer. Pet June 11. London, June 20 at 11.30. Sol Edwards, 15 St Swithin's-lane.
 Baker, James, 8 Tomlin's-ter, Crisp-st, Poplar, Basket Maker. Pet June 11. London, July 1 at 10. Sol Abbott, 1 St Mark-st, London.
 Bamford, Robert Carter, 6 Sutherland-st, Pimlico, retired Major in the Army. Pet June 6 (in forma pauperis). London, June 23 at 12. Sol Aldridge, 46 Moregate-st.
 Bancroft, Charles, Shakespeare-st, Nottingham, Tailor. Pet June 12. Nottingham, July 16 at 10. Sol Heathcote, Nottingham.
 Blakeney, William Purdon, Oxton-rd, Birkenhead, Surgeon. Pet June 9. Liverpool, June 25 at 11. Sols Pemberton, Liverpool, and Gill, Birkenhead.
 Brice, Charles Elly, Wilton, Somersetshire. Pet June 9. Taunton, June 27 at 12. Sol Rosseter, Taunton.
 Brittain, Edward, Jun, Falkingham, Lincolnshire, Butcher. Pet June 10. Bourn, July 2 at 12. Sol Law, Stamford.
 Browne, George, 1 Waltham-cottages, Warner-rd, Camberwell, Banker's Clerk. Pet June 7. London, June 24 at 11.30. Sol Riches, 21 Coleman-st.
 Chapman, Joseph, Scarborough, China Dealer. Pet June 7. Leeds, June 26 at 11. Sols Bond & Barwick, Leeds.
 Chewor, Henry, Audlem, Cheshire, Wheelwright. June 9. Liverpool June 23 at 12.
 Cleaver, Robert, Stretton-upon-Dunsmore, Warwickshire, Carpenter. Pet June 9. Rugby, June 25 at 11. Sol Overall, Leamington Priory.
 Coates, William, Bishop Wilton, Yorkshire, Farmer. Pet June 10. Leeds, June 23 at 11. Sols Bond & Barwick, Leeds.
 Collins, Henry George, & William Pappill Collins, Hale Mills, Staines, Fibre Manufacturers. Pet June 11. London, July 1 at 10. Sols Lawrence & Co, 14 Old Jewry-chambers.
 Corles, Thomas, Birmingham, Attorney-at-Law and Solicitor. Pet June 9. Birmingham, June 27 at 12. Sol Wright, Birmingham.

Crombleholme, Elizabeth, Birkenhead, Innkeeper. Pet May 16. Liverpool, June 25 at 11. Sols Neale & Martin, Liverpool.

Dann, William John, Birmingham, Warehouseman. June 10. Birmingham, June 27 at 12. Sols James & Knight, Birmingham.

Danks, Henry, Longford, Moreton Say, Salop, Veterinary Surgeon. Pet June 11. Market Drayton, June 28 at 3. Sol Onions, Market Drayton.

Davies, Walter, Craven-st, Hulme, Manchester, Packer. Pet June 9. Salford, June 28 at 10. Sol Swan, Manchester.

Desborough, Thomas, Little Stoughton Bedfordshire, Farmer. Pet June 11. London, June 25 at 11.30. Sols Parker & Co, 17 Bedford-row.

Dowse, Henry George, 46 Dale-st, Liverpool, Commission Merchant. Pet May 29. Liverpool, June 25 at 12. Sol Samuel, Liverpool.

Dugard, Henry, Birmingham, Dealer in Guns. June 10. Birmingham, June 30 at 12. Sols James & Knight, Birmingham.

Dunger, William, 2a Seymour-pl West, Brompton, Commission Agent. Pet June 9. London, June 25 at 1.30. Sol Giles, 44 Bedford-row.

Durbridge, Richard, 2a Chestow-pl, Baywater, Tailor. Pet June 9. London, July 1 at 10. Sols Gibbs & Tucker, 3 Lothery.

Fairman, James, 23 Jermyn-st, Gunmaker. Pet June 7. London, June 24 at 1. Sols White & Sons, 11 Bedford-row.

Faulkes, Bryan Flinders, Caythorpe, Nottinghamshire, Miller. Pet June 10. Nottingham, July 1 at 11. Sols Cowley & Eversall, Nottingham.

Gingaid, Moritz, 27 Camden-st North, Middlesex, Commission Agent. Pet June 10. London, June 24 at 2. Sol Hand, 23 Coleman-st.

Gisborne, James, Birmingham, Musical Instrument Maker. Pet June 10. Birmingham, June 30 at 12. Sol Parry, Birmingham.

Godber, James, Hyson-green, Nottinghamshire, Baker. Pet June 5. Nottingham, July 16 at 10. Sol Coope, Nottingham.

Graham, Bryce, Ardwick-grove, Manchester, Draper. Pet June 6. Manchester, June 25 at 11. Sols Corbett & Wheeler, Manchester.

Hague, George, Sheffield, Builder. Pet June 12. Sheffield, June 30 at 10. Sol Unwin, Sheffield.

Hambridge, William, Great Warley, near Brentwood, Licensed Victualler. Pet June 7. London, June 24 at 1. Sol Waldron, 59 Lamb's Conduit-st.

Harris, Lewis, Malins Lee, Dawley, Salop, Stocktaker. Pet June 9. Madeley, July 12 at 12. Sol Beeston, Wellington.

Harrison, Joseph, Bright-st, Bradford, Grocer. Pet June 9. Bradford, June 24 at 10.30. Sol Hutchinson, Bradford.

Harrison, Joshua, Leeds, Scribbling Miller. Pet June 10. Leeds, June 26 at 11. Sol Booth, Leeds.

Hastett, William, 18 St Martin's-le-grand, Hosier. Pet May 30. London, June 25 at 12. Sols Davidson & Co, Weaver's-hall.

Hirons, William, Birmingham-rd, Staffordshire, Publican. Pet June 11. Oldbury, June 30 at 12. Sols Hayes & Wright, Oldbury.

Holt, Amos, 10 Joseph-st, Leeds-rd, Bradford, Commission Agent. Pet May 30 (in forma pauperis). Bradford, June 24 at 10.30. Sol Mason, York.

Hopkins, Patrick Stephen, Egremont, Grocer. Pet June 3. Liverpool, June 25 at 11.30. Sol Hasband, Liverpool.

Hough, Samuel, Adlow, Derbyshire, Farmer. Pet June 10. Nottingham, July 1 at 11. Sol Wells, Nottingham.

Jones, Benjamin, 91 High-st, Merthyr Tydfil, Grocer. Pet June 10. Merthyr Tydfil, June 25 at 11. Sol Smith, Merthyr Tydfil.

Keovil, James, 53 Melbourne-st, Liverpool, Chair Manufacturer. Pet June 11. Liverpool, June 25 at 3. Sol Ward, Liverpool.

Kendrick, George Edmiston, 12 Watney-st, Middlesex, Trinity Pilot. Pet June 7. London, June 25 at 11. Sols Wright & Bonner, 16 London-st.

Keyworth, Ira, Harby, Nottinghamshire, Butcher. Pet June 10. Nottingham, July 1 at 11. Sols Brown & Son, Lincoln.

Maggott, William, Spoil Bank, Rugby, Labourer. Pet June 7. Rugby, June 25 at 11. Sol Overall, Leamington, Officers.

Marchant, Nathaniel, 52 Great Portland-st, Printers. Pet June 12. London, June 25 at 11.30. Sol Harcourt, King's Arms-yard.

Masters, John Francis, 2 Highbury-pl, Bristol, Perfumer. Pet June 5. Bristol, July 1 at 11. Sols King & Pinner.

Mathew, Esther, Garshilton, Surrey, Milliner. Pet June 9. London, June 23 at 11.30. Sol Pelle, 5 Barge-yard, Bucklersbury.

McMillin, James, 13 Angel-st, Cardiff, Hair Dresser. Pet June 11. Cardiff, June 30 at 11. Sol Wilcocks, Cardiff.

Mellard, Jean George, 56 Great Guildford-st, Southwark, and 79 Blackfriars-rd, Surrey, Hat Manufacturer. Pet June 3. London, June 23 at 11. Sol Marsden, 50 Walbrook.

Mitchell, William, Leeds, Cloth Manufacturer. Pet June 10. Leeds, June 23 at 11. Sols Bond & Warwick, Leeds.

Meachel, Edouard, late of 85 Drummond-st, Euston-agg, Middlesex, Surgeon. Pet June 6 (in forma pauperis). London, June 23 at 11.30. Sol Aldridge, 46 Moorgate-st.

Nicoll, Samuel James, 17 South-st, Devonport, Lieutenant in the Royal Marines. Pet June 7. East Stonehouse, June 25 at 11. Sols Beer & Rundle, Devonport.

Peach, Christopher, Newport, Monmouthshire, Commercial Traveller. Pet June 6. Sheffield, June 30 at 10. Sol Fretson, Sheffield.

Perry, Esther, Forty-hill, Enfield, Plumber. Pet June 9. London, July 1 at 10. Sol Webb, 7 Lincoln's-inn-fields.

Porter, Henry, Ealing, Middlesex, Boot and Shoe Maker. Pet June 11. London, June 24 at 2. Sol Haynes, 12 Southampton-bldgs, Chancery-in.

Rees, Thomas Dolton, Frog-st, Swansea, Mariner. Pet April 11. Swansea, June 25 at 12. Sol Ensor, Cardiff.

Reidhead, Thomas, Penny Bridge, Ulverston, Innkeeper. Pet June 9. Ulverston, June 23 at 12. Sol Jackson, Ulverston.

Rhodes, James, Smilthy Ridge, Rochdale, Grocer. Pet June 9. Rochdale, June 23 at 11. Sol Hilland, Rochdale.

Richards, James, Swingate House, Cliffe, near Rochester, Market Gardener. Pet June 10. Rochester, June 23 at 2. Sol Morgan, Maidstone.

Riger, Jacob, 52 Parker's-row, Dockhead, Saddler. Pet June 11. London, July 1 at 10. Sols J. & W. Butler, 191 Toodle-st.

Intherford, Frederick West, 26 Clifton-st, Brighton, Commercial Traveller. Pet June 9. Brighton, June 30 at 11. Sol Goodman, Brighton.

Schneider, William, Middlesborough, Yorkshire, Cabinet Maker. Pet June 10. Stockton-on-Tees, June 27 at 2. Sol Dobson, Middlesborough.

Siddall, John, Checkheath, Birstal, Yorkshire, Printer. Pet June 11. Leeds, June 23 at 11. Sols Carriss & Tempest, Leeds.

Smith, John, Sherborne-st, Cheltenham, Grocer. Pet June 12. Bristol, June 24 at 11. Sols Corles, Worcester, and Abbot, Lucas, & Leonard, Bristol.

Spencer, Robert, & Robert Spencer, Jun., 10 and 11 Bridgewater-gardens,

Barbican, Bookbinders. Pet June 7. London, June 24 at 1. Sols Young & Pews, 29 Mark-lane, London.

Spokes, Daniel, 85 Great College-st, Camden-town, Grocer. Pet June 11. London, June 24 at 2. Sol Greenwood, 85 Chancery-lane.

Strange, James George Young, Bath, Brewer. Pet June 9. Bristol, June 27 at 11. Sol Brittan, Bristol.

Swithenbank, John, sen., Stott-hill, Bradford, Yeoman. Pet May 30 (in forma pauperis). Bradford, June 24 at 10.30. Sol Mason, York.

Swithenbank, John, Jun., Stott-hill, Bradford, Clerk in Holy Orders. Pet May 30 (in forma pauperis). Bradford, June 24 at 10.30. Sol Mason, York.

Thomson, William Henry, Birmingham, Money Scrivener. Pet June 3. Birmingham, June 30 at 12. Sol Wright, Birmingham.

Wathall, Thomas, Derwent-st, Derby, Cabinet Maker. Pet June 9. Derby, June 24 at 12. Sol Briggs, Derby.

Webb, Henry, Bilson Woodside, Gloucestershire, Confectioner. Pet June 6. Newnham, July 4 at 11. Sol Gould, Newnham.

Webb, Thomas, Wolverhampton, Licensed Victualler. Pet June 9. Birmingham, June 27 at 12. Sols Reece, Birmingham, and Paines, Shrewsbury.

Wilkinson, Thomas, Morley, Yorkshire, Cloth Manufacturer. Pet June 10. Leeds, June 25 at 11. Sol Simpson, Leeds.

Wood, Henry, 70 Moland-st, Birmingham, Brass Caster. Pet June 9. Birmingham, June 23 at 12. Sol East, Birmingham.

TUESDAY, June 17, 1862.

Bailey, Albert, Shierhampton, Gloucestershire, Labourer. Pet June 11. Bristol, July 3 at 12. Sols Clifton & Benson.

Barns, Count Thomas, 5 Pantons-st, Haymarket, Auctioneer's Clerk. Pet June 10. London, July 4 at 12. Sol Field, 40 Ely-place, London.

Barry, Thomas, 26 Clifton-st, Brighton, Bootmaker. Pet June 12. Brighton, July 2 at 11. Sol Goodman, 73 Ship-st, Brighton.

Beer, William, 20 Dock Wall, Devonport, Devonshire, Stone Mason. Pet June 10. East Stonehouse, July 2 at 11. Sol Floud, Exeter.

Bedford, James, 86 New Weston-st, Bermondsey, Surrey, Boot Maker. Pet June 11. London, July 4 at 2. Sol Chipperfield, 3 Trinity-st, Southwark.

Bennett, John, Swaine-st, Bradford, Yorkshire, Commission Agent. Leeds, June 30 at 11.

Birch, George, Harnsea-head, Wolsanton, Staffordshire, Builder. Pet June 14. Hanley, June 28 at 11. Sol Litchfield, Newcastle-under-Lyme.

Brassington, Frederick Taylor, Stoke-upon-Trent, Staffordshire, Beer house Keeper. Pet June 9. Stoke-upon-Trent, June 23 at 11. Sols E. & A. Tennant, Hanley.

Burgess, William, Raunds, Northamptonshire, Tailor. Pet June 11. Newcastle-upon-Tyne, July 3 at 12. Sols Harle & Co, 20 Southampton-buildings, London, and 2 Butcher Bank, Newcastle-on-Tyne.

Campbell, Henry, 13 Chilton-st, Lower-rd, Depford, Kent, Trunk Maker. Pet June 9. London, July 4 at 12.30. Sol Holt, Quality-court, Chancery-lane.

Cattle, Joseph Edward, 108 Granby-st, Leicester, Carver and Gilder. Pet June 12. Leicester, July 2 at 10. Sol Weston, Friar-lane, Leicester.

Clark, Thomas, 9 Victoria-grove-terrace, Bayswater, Middlesex, Dealer in Curiosities. Pet June 11. London, June 30 at 11. Sol Howell, 61 Cheapside, London.

Coley, William, 35 Nelson-at Sand Pits, Birmingham, Iron Plate Worker. Pet June 11. Birmingham, July 7 at 12. Sol East, 45 Ann-st, Birmingham.

Darling, Henry, 17 Terrace-pl, Leazes, Boot and Shoe Maker. Pet May 29. Newcastle-upon-Tyne, July 5 at 11. Sol Johnston, 3 Collingwood-st, Newcastle-upon-Tyne.

Davies, Griffith Vaughan, 17 Weymouth-st, Portland-pl, Middlesex, Fancy Stationer. Pet June 13 (in forma pauperis). London, July 4 at 2. Sol Aldridge, 46 Moorgate-st.

Davis, Charles, 3 Oxford-ter, Park-rd, Clapham, Surrey, Glass and China Merchant. Pet June 12. London, July 4 at 12. Sol Abilt, 6 Newcastle-st, Strand.

Dawson, John, 3 Windsor-pl, Hoxton, Middlesex, Shoemaker. Pet June 13 (in forma pauperis). London, July 4 at 2.30. Sol Aldridge, 46 Moorgate-st.

Deville, Isaac, Newbridge-lane, Stockport, Cheshire, Cotton Spinner. April 22. Stockport, July 4 at 12. Sol Churton, Chester.

Dingley, William Nahari, Liverpool, Merchant. Pet May 13. Liverpool, June 28 at 11. Sol Pemberton, 13 Cable-st, Liverpool.

Dulleas, Hugo, 8 St James-st, Bermondsey, Commission Agent. Pet June 13. London, July 1 at 11. Sol Woolf, 17 King-st, Cheapside.

Edwards, Edward Henry, 5 Euston-pl, Upper Holloway, Middlesex, Oil and Colourman. Pet June 9. London, June 30 at 11. Sol Cooper, 9 Charing-cross.

Embleton, William, Farleigh, Essex, Baker. June 4. London, June 30 at 12. Sols Digby & Son, 90 Chancery-lane.

Farley, William, Bristol. Pet June 13. Bristol, July 4 at 11. Sols Clifton & Benson, Bristol.

Frewer, Stephen, 261 Oxford-st, Middlesex, Saddler. Pet May 29. London, June 30 at 11. Sol Sweetland, 55 Lincoln's-inn-fields.

Garner, Charles, Eastfriesland, Sussex, Farmer. May 12. London, June 30 at 11. Sols Aldridge & Bromley, 46 Moorgate-st.

Godber, Joseph, Hyson-green, Nottinghamshire, Journeyman Baker. Pet June 5. Nottingham, July 16 at 10. Sol Coope, Nottingham.

Goddard, John Alexander, 50 Wood-st, Chapside, London, Custom House Agent. Pet June 6. London, July 4 at 11. Sol G. Holmer, Jun., 24 Bucklersbury.

Green, Henry, 16 Market-st, Earl-st, London-rd, Southwark, Surrey, Grocer. Pet June 14. London, June 30 at 12. Sol Webb, Jewry-st.

Hambidge, William, Great Warley, Brentwood, Essex, Licensed Victualler. Pet June 7. London, June 24 at 1. Sol Waldron, 59 Lamb's Conduit-street.

Harding, William, 49 Side, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Licensed Victualler. Pet June 6. Newcastle-upon-Tyne, July 5 at 11. Sol Joel, 76 Grey-st, Newcastle-upon-Tyne.

Harrison, William, and John Harrison, Leeds, Scribbling Millers. Pet June 16. Leeds, June 30 at 11. Sol Booth, Leeds.

Hedges, Charles Cooper, Great Faringdon, Berks, Tailor. Pet June 11. London, July 4 at 1.30. Sols Richards & Walker, 39 Lincoln's-inn-fields, for Cave, Newbury.

Henson, James John, 21 Worrington-st, Oakley-ag., Middlesex. Pet June 13 (in forma pauperis). London, July 1 at 11. Sols Aldridge & Bromley, 46 Moorgate-st.

Healington, Thomas, sen, 50 Camp-hill, Birmingham, Agent. Pet June 11. Birmingham, July 7 at 10. Sol East, 45 Ann-st, Birmingham.

Holder, Mark, 122 Pritchett-st, Birmingham. Pearl Button Manufacturer. Pet June 13. Birmingham, July 7 at 10. Sol Duke, 15 Newhall-st, Birmingham.

Holdom, Edwin, Earl Russell Beer Shop, 1 Brighton-pl, Brixton-rd, Lambeth, Beer Retailer. Pet June 10. London, July 4 at 11.30. Sol Hill, 10 Basinghall-st.

Holmes, William, Old Byland, North Riding, Yorkshire, Innkeeper. Pet June 13. Helmsley, June 27 at 12. Sol Richardson, Thirsk.

Holmes, William, 149 Snows-fields, Bernondsey, Surrey, Zinc Worker. Pet June 13 (in forma pauperis). London, June 30 at 1. Sols Aldridge & Bromley, 46 Moorgate-st.

Howard, Robert Henry, 63 Clarendon-st, Church-rd, Kingston, Portsea, Painter. Pet June 12. Portsmouth, July 15 at 11. Sol Paffard, Portsea.

Keyes, Edmund Thomas, King's Arms, Great Suffolk-st, Southwark, Surrey, Licensed Victualler. Pet June 13. London, June 30 at 11.30. Sol Wyatt, 2 Cophthall-bldgs.

Lamond, James, 18 Abingdon-st, Westminster, Middlesex, Parliamentary Agent. Pet June 12. London, July 1 at 11. Sols Miller & Smith, 6 Chatham-pl, Blackfriars.

Marnas, Benoit Julien, 34 Frith-st, Soho, Middlesex, Tailor. Pet June 14. London, June 30 at 11. Sol Lewis, 29 Great Marlborough-st.

McAlister, John, 28 Millicent-st, Cardiff, Contractor. Pet June 14. Bristol, July 4 at 11. Sol Wilcocks, Cardiff.

McAuliffe, Daniel, Tower-hill, St Philip, Bristol, Dealer in Eggs. Pet June 13. Bristol, July 4 at 11. Sol Bevan, Bristol.

McGill, Joseph Henry, 15 Liverpool-st, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Working Brewer. Pet June 11. Newcastle-upon-Tyne, July 5 at 11. Sol Brewis, 59 Grey-st, Newcastle-upon-Tyne.

McIntosh, John, 41 and 42 Bow-lane, Cheapside, London, Timber Merchant. Pet June 14. London, July 4 at 11.30. Sols Linklaters & Harchwood, 7 Walbrook.

Mori, Charles Henry, 15 Graham-st, Eaton-sq, Middlesex, Clerk. Pet June 12. London, July 1 at 11. Sol Orchard, John-st, Bedford-row.

Morgan, David, Mill-st, Trecynon, Aberdare, Glamorganshire, Grocer. Pet June 13. Bristol, July 4 at 11. Sols Smith, Merthyr, and Abbott, Lucas, & Leonard, Bristol.

Murphy, George, Albert-st, Camden-town, Middlesex, Pianoforte Maker. Pet June 14. London, July 1 at 11. Sol Strong, 44 Jewin-st, Cripplegate.

Norledge, Elizabeth, Newark-upon-Trent, Nottinghamshire, Clothier. Pet June 7. Newark-upon-Trent, June 25 at 12. Sol Ashley, Newark-upon-Trent.

Nett, Richard, 5 Crescent, Kensington, Middlesex, Commission Agent. Pet June 13 (in forma pauperis). London, July 4 at 2.30. Sol Aldridge, 46 Moorgate-st.

Ottaway, James, Saracen and King, Great Bookham, Surrey, Licensed Victualler. Pet June 16. London, July 1 at 12. Sols Lawrence, Flaws, & Boyer, 14 Old Jewry-chambers.

Palmer, George Gidley, Waterbeers-st, Exeter, Printer. Pet June 6. Exeter, June 30 at 11. Sol Terrell, Exeter.

Payne, Thomas, 2 Old Dorset-pl, Clapham-rd, Surrey, Licensed Victualler. Pet June 12. London, July 1 at 11. Sol Downey, Kennington-rd.

Reed, Caroline, 238 Euston-rd, Middlesex, Spinster. Pet June 14. London, June 30 at 1. Sol Walker, 70 Basinghall-st.

Robinson, Thomas, Hartlepool, Durham, Hair Dresser. Pet June 11. Newcastle-upon-Tyne, July 3 at 11. Sols Watson, Durham, and Hoyle Newcastle-upon-Tyne.

Roman, Alfred James, 156 White Cross-st, St Lukes, Middlesex, Grocer. Pet June 13. London, July 1 at 11. Sols Marshall & Son, 12 Hattogarden.

Russell, Thomas, Lower Mitcham, Surrey, Carpenter. Pet June 14. London, July 1 at 11. Sol Silvester, Great Dover-st, Borough.

Shaw, Richard, 71 Melbourne-st, Liverpool, Licensed Pilot. Pet June 13. Liverpool, June 30 at 2. Sol Ward, Liverpool.

Slidebottom, John, 3 Borough-market, Wakefield, Poulterer. Pet June 14. Wakefield, June 28 at 11. Sol Hall, 37 Brown-st, Manchester.

Smith, William King, Hatchett's Hotel, Piccadilly, Middlesex, Gent. Pet June 14. London, June 30 at 11. Sol Howell, 61 Cheapside.

Smith, Thomas Timmis Vernon, 31 Park-rd, Islington, Middlesex, Engineer. Pet June 14. London, July 1 at 11. Sols Stopher, Freston, & Watt, 35 Coleman-st.

Squibb, John, Holt, Wimbome Minster, Dorset, Labourer. June 12. Wimbome Minster, June 26 at 11.

Stevens, James, Clapham-common, Surrey, Auctioneer. Pet June 12. London, July 1 at 11.30. Sol Shepherd, 9 Sive-lane.

Storey, William, Mold-green, Huddersfield, Innkeeper. Pet June 4. Leeds, June 27 at 11. Sols Floyd & Leary, Huddersfield, and Bond & Barwick, Leeds.

Taylor, Henry, sen, Kirkgate, Wakefield, Assistant. Pet June 14. Wakefield, June 28 at 11. Sol Hill, 37 Brown-st, Manchester.

Taylor, John Lott, North Shields, Northumberland, Shipowner. Pet June 12. Newcastle-upon-Tyne, July 3 at 12. Sols J. & E. S. Watson Newcastle-upon-Tyne.

Vaughn, Thomas, Old Station-rd, Tunbridge Wells, Kent, Butcher. Pet June 14. Tunbridge Wells, June 30 at 12. Sols Howard, Halse, & Trustram, 66 Paternoster-row, London, and Tunbridge Wells.

Waller, Thomas Kirkbride, & Christopher Graham, Silloth, Holme, Cultram, Cumberland, Timber Merchants. Pet June 11. Newcastle-upon-Tyne, June 30 at 1. Sols Wannop, Carlisle, and Hoyle Newcastle-upon-Tyne.

Walke, Edward William Lavers, Ridgeway, Plympton St. Mary, Devonshire, Butcher. Pet June 5. East Stonehouse, July 3 at 11. Sols Beer & Rundle, Devonport.

Ward, Robert Jackson, and David Perry, Sunderland, Durham, Millers. Pet June 11. Newcastle-upon-Tyne, July 3 at 12. Sol Burn, Sunderland.

White, James, 50 Redcliffe-st, Bristol, Boot and Shoe Maker. Pet June 12. Bristol, June 30 at 11. Sols Abbott, Lucas, & Leonard, Bristol.

Wicks, William, 74 High-row, Silver-st, Kensington-gravel-pits, Middlesex, Builder. Pet June 4. London, June 30 at 1. Sol Parsons, 43 Basinghall-st.

Williams, William, 15 Freshland-pl, Hotwells, Bristol, Grocer. Pet June 12. Bristol, July 3 at 12. Sols Clifton & Benson.

Wilson, George, Coppull Moor, Coppull, Lancashire, Wheelwright. Pet June 12. Chorley, July 10 at 9. Sol Anderton, Chorley.

Wilson, Robert, 219 Queen's-rd, Dalston, Middlesex. Pet June 13. London, June 30 at 11. Sol Atkinson, 73 Basinghall-st.

Wool, Samuel, 15 Queen-st, Blackfriars-rd, Surrey, Bricklayer. Pet June 13 (in forma pauperis). London, July 1 at 11. Sols Aldridge & Bromley, 46 Moorgate-st.

BANKRUPTCIES ANNULLED.

FRIDAY, June 13, 1862.

Crowe, Wilah. Middleton-upon-the-Wolds, Yorkshire, Corn Miller. June 6.

Rawlin, John Henry, 139 Leadenhall-st, London, Tailor. June 10.

Richards, John Lawrie, 23 Parliament-st, Westminster, Engineer. June 3.

TUESDAY, June 17, 1862.

Gent, George, 20 Baker-st, Portman-sq, Wine & Spirit Agent. June 16.

Maliphant, John, & Dan Lloyd, Brynmawr, Brecon, Grocers. June 16.

Squires, John, Burgh Castle, Suffolk, Farmer. June 12.

GUARDIAN FIRE AND LIFE ASSURANCE COMPANY, No. 11, Lombard-street, London, E.C.

Established 1821.

SUBSCRIBED CAPITAL, TWO MILLIONS. PAID UP, ONE MILLION.

DIRECTORS.

Sir MINTO PARQUHAR, Bart., M.P., Chairman.
CHARLES WILLIAM CUTLER, Esq., Deputy Chairman.

Henry Hulce Berens, Esq.
Henry Bonham Carter, Esq.
Chas. F. Devas, Esq.
Francis Hart Dyke, Esq.
Sir Walter R. Farguhar, Bart.
James Goodson, Esq.
Thomson Hankey, Esq., M.P.
John Harvey, Esq.
John G. Hubbard, Esq., M.P.

John Labouchere, Esq.
John Martin, Esq.
Rowland Mitchell, Esq.
James Morris, Esq.
Henry Norman, Esq.
Henry R. Reynolds, Esq.
Abraham John Roberts, Esq.
James Tulloch, Esq.
Henry Vigne, Esq.

AUDITORS.

Lewis Lloyd, Esq.
Cornelius Paine, Jun., Esq.
Thomas Tallemaach, Esq., Secretary.

Henry Sykes Thomson, Esq.
Noel Whiting, Esq.
Samuel Brown, Esq., Actuary.

LIFE DEPARTMENT.—Under the provisions of an Act of Parliament, this Company now offers to new Insurers EIGHTY PER CENT. OF THE PROFITS, AT QUINQUENNIAL DIVISIONS, OR A LOW RATE OF PREMIUM, without participation of Profits.

Since the establishment of the Company in 1821, the Amount of Profits allotted to the Assured has exceeded in Cash value £660,000, which represents equivalent Reversionary Bonuses of £1,036,000.

After the Division of Profits at Christmas, 1859, the Life Assurances in force, with existing Bonuses thereon, amounted to upwards of £4,780,000; the Income from the Life Branch £207,000 per annum; and the Life Assurance Fund, independent of the Capital, exceeded £1,618,000.

LOCAL MILITIA AND VOLUNTEER CORPS.—No extra Premium is required for service therein.

INVALID LIVES assured at corresponding Extra Premiums.

LOANS granted on Life Policies to the extent of their values, if such value be not less than £50.

ASSIGNMENTS OF POLICIES.—Written notices of, received and registered.

MEDICAL FEES paid by the Company, and no charge for Policy Stamps.

Notice is hereby given, that FIRE policies which expire at Midsummer must be renewed within fifteen days at this Office, or with Mr. SAMS, No. 1, St. James's-street, corner of Pall Mall; or with the Company's Agents throughout the Kingdom, otherwise they become void.

Losses caused by Explosion of Gas are admitted by this Company.

EQUITABLE REVERSIONARY INTEREST SOCIETY, 10, Lancaster-place, Strand.—Persons desirous of disposing of Reversionary Property, Life Interests, and Life Policies of Assurance, may do so at this Office to any extent, and for the full value, without the delay, expense, and uncertainty of an Auction.

Forms of Proposal may be obtained at the Office as above, and of Mr. HENDRICKS, the Actuary of the Society, Globe Insurance, Cornhill.

JOHN CLAYTON, } Joint Secretaries.
F. S. CLAYTON, }

THE CITY HAT COMPANY, 109, SHOE LANE, Nine Doors from Fleet-street.

LIST OF PRICES.

The Celebrated New Tariff Paris Hais 3s. 6d. each.
Capital Business Hats 4s. 6d. "
Rich Italian Velvet Hais 6s. 6d. "
Superior Quality in all Shapes 6s. 6d. "
Best Hais in London (worth 12s.) 9s. 6d. "

Felt Hats of every description for Shipping.
109, SHOE LANE (Nine Doors from Fleet-street).

OFFICE AND HOUSEHOLD FURNITURE

of every description. Fire Proof Safes, all second Hand, by the most eminent makers, continually on sale. The largest stock in London at L. SOLOMONSON'S 10, Water-lane, Blackfriars, facing Apothecaries' Hall. Established 1832.

COAL.—The GUINEA COAL COMPANY'S WALLENDS all the year round, can only be obtained by addressing to the Secretary, Mr. JAMES JENNINGS, 7, York-road, King's-cross Station, N. Coke, &c.

CONSUMPTION IN ALL ITS STAGES,

Coughs, Whooping Cough, Asthma, Bronchitis, Fever, Ague, Diphtheria, Hysteria, Rheumatism, Diarrhoea, Spasms, Colic, Rona, and Uterine Diseases are immediately relieved by a dose of CHLOROXYNE, (Trade Mark) discovered and named by Dr. J. COLLIS BROWNE M.R.C.S.L., Ex-Army Medical Staff.

The question asked by invalids, families, and households is—What is the best medicine to give in the above diseases, and what to have always ready? Medical testimony, the reply of thousands of sufferers and invalids, is—confirmatory of the invaluable relief afforded by this remedy above all others.

CHLOROXYNE is a liquid taken in drops according to age. It invariably relieves pain of whatever kind; creates a calm refreshing sleep; allays irritation of the nervous system when all other remedies fail; leaving no bad effects like opium or laudanum, and can be taken when none other can be tolerated. Its value in saving life in infancy is not easily estimated; a few drops will subdue the irritation of Teething, prevent and arrest Convulsions, cure Whooping Cough, Spasms, and Flatulency at once.

Among Invalids it allays the pain of Neuralgia, Rheumatism, Gout, &c. It soothes the weary aching of Consumption, relieves the Soreness of the Chest, Cough, and Expectoration; and cures all Chest affections, such as Asthma, Bronchitis, Palpitation, &c. It checks Diarrhoea, Alvine Discharges, or Spasms and Colics of the Intestines, &c.

The extensive demand for this remedy, known as Dr. J. COLLIS BROWNE'S CHLOROXYNE, by the Medical Profession, Hospitals, Dispensaries—Civil, Military, and Naval—and Families especially, guarantees that this statement of its extreme importance and value is a *bona fide* one, and worthy the attention of all.

EXTRACTS OF MEDICAL OPINIONS.

From W. VERALUIS PETHORKE, M.D.—"I have no hesitation in stating that I have never met with any medicine so efficacious as an anti-spasmodic and sedative. I have used it in Consumption, Asthma, Diarrhoea and other diseases, and am most perfectly satisfied with the results."

From Dr. M'ILLAN, of New Galloway, Scotland.—"I consider it the most valuable medicine known."

G. HATWARD, Esq., Surgeon, Stow-on-ye-Wold.—"I am now using Dr. J. COLLIS BROWNE'S CHLOROXYNE with marvelous good effects in allaying nreterate sickness in pregnancy."

Dr. M'GIBSON, Caorft, late Army Staff, says: "It is a most valuable medicine."

J. C. BAKER, Esq., M.D., Bideford: "It is without doubt the most valuable and certain anodyne we have."

Dr. GIBSON, Army Medical Staff, Calcutta: "Two doses completely cured me of Diarrhoea."

From G. V. RIBOUT, Esq., Surgeon, Egham: "As an astringent in severe Diarrhoea, and an anti-spasmodic in Cholice, with Cramps in the Abdomen, the relief is instantaneous. As a sedative in Neuralgia and Tic-Doloureux its effects were very remarkable. In Uterine Affections I have found it extremely valuable."

CAUTION.—Beware of Spurious Compounds, or Imitations of "Chlorodyne." Dr. Browne placed the Recipe for making "Chlorodyne" in the hands of Mr. Davenport ONLY; consequently there can be no other Manufacturer. The genuine bears the words "Dr. J. Collis Browne's Chlorodyne" on the Government Stamp of each Bottle.

Sold only in Bottles, at 2s. 9d., and 4s. 6d., by the Sole Agent and Manufacturer, J. T. DAVENPORT, 33, Great Russell-street, Bloomsbury-square, London.

JOHN GOSNELL & CO., PERFUMERS TO THE QUEEN, beg to recommend the following Fashionable and Superior Articles for the TOILET to the especial notice of all purchasers of Choice PERFUMERY.

John Gosnell & Co.'s JOCKEY CLUB PERFUME, in universal request as the most admired perfume for the handkerchief, price 2s. 6d.

John Gosnell & Co.'s LA NOBLESSE PERFUME—a most delicate perfume of exquisite fragrance.

John Gosnell & Co.'s GARRIBALDI BOUQUET—a most choice and fashionable perfume.

John Gosnell & Co.'s RUSSIAN LEATHER PERFUME—a very fashionable and agreeable perfume.

John Gosnell & Co.'s BALL-ROOM COMPANION or FOUNTAIN PERFUMES. Elegant Novelties, in the form of Portable Handkerchief Perfumes in a neat case, which emits on pressure a jet of most refreshing perfume. Price 1s. and 1s. 6d. each.

John Gosnell & Co.'s LA NOBLESSE POMADE—elegantly perfumed, and highly recommended for beautifying and promoting the growth of Hair.

John Gosnell & Co.'s GOLDEN OIL—Mouline—Macassar Oil—Bears Grease, &c., for the Hair.

John Gosnell & Co.'s CHERRY TOOTH PASTE is greatly superior to any Tooth Powder, gives the Teeth a pearl-like whiteness, protects the enamel from decay, and imparts a pleasing fragrance to the breath.

John Gosnell & Co.'s AMBROSIAL SHAVING CREAM, 1s. and 1s. 6d. in pots; also, in compressible tubes, for the convenience of persons travelling, price 1s.

John Gosnell and Co.'s INSTANTANEOUS HAIR DYE—The only Hair Dye which produces a good natural colour with perfect certainty, and with the least possible trouble.

Manufactory, 12, Three King-court, Lombard-street, London.

HOLLOWAY'S PILLS.—Priceless Health.—In

most human acts there are a thousand ways of going wrong to one of going right. The right way to preserve, or restore, health is to keep the blood pure and the corporeal functions regular. These objects are quietly and fully attained by Holloway's Balsamic Pills, which purge from the system all morbid matters before they have caused any serious derangements; or if mischief has been already produced, they arrest its progress and repair its devastations. This is the only rational treatment—ever safe, always effective. When the spirits flag, when the nerves fall in their duty, when the appetite is capricious, and the digestion is at fault, these admirable Pills will readily re-organize the disordered actions.

GLENFIELD PATENT STARCH, USED IN THE ROYAL LAUNDRY.

THE LADIES are respectfully informed that this STARCH is EXCLUSIVELY USED IN THE ROYAL LAUNDRY.

And HER MAJESTY'S LAUNDRESS says, that although she has tried WHEATST, RICE, and other POWDER STARCHES, she has found none of them equal to the GLENFIELD, which is THE FINEST STARCH SHE EVER USED.

WHEN YOU ASK FOR GLENFIELD PATENT STARCH,

See that you get it, as inferior kinds are often substituted.

WOTHERSPOON & CO., GLASGOW AND LONDON.

SLACK'S SILVER ELECTRO PLATE is a coating of pure Silver over Nickel. A combination of two metals possessing such valuable properties renders it in appearance and wear equal to Sterling Silver.

	Fiddle Pattern.	Thread.	King's.
	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.
Table Forks, per doz.....	1 10 0 and 1 18 0	2 8 0	3 0 0
Dessert ditto	1 0 0 and 1 10 0	1 15 0	2 2 0
Table Spoons	1 10 0 and 1 18 0	2 8 0	3 0 0
Dessert ditto	1 0 0 and 1 10 0	1 15 0	2 2 0
Tea Spoons	0 12 0 and 0 18 0	1 3 6	1 10 0

Every Article for the Table as in Silver.—A Sample Tea Spoon forwarded on receipt of 20 stamps.

SLACK'S FENDER AND FIRE-IRON WARE—

HOUSE is the MOST ECONOMICAL, consistent with good quality.—Iron Fenders, 2s. 6d.; Bronzed ditto, 3s. 6d., with standards; superior Drawing-room ditto, 14s. 6d. to 50s.; Fire Irons, 2s. 6d. to 20s.; Patent Dish Covers, with handles to take off, 18s. set of six. Table Knives and Forks, 8s. per dozen. Roasting Jacks, complete, 7s. 6d. Tea-trays, 6s. 6d. set of three; elegant Papier Maché ditto, 25s. the set. Teapots, with plated knob, 5s. 6d.; Coal Scuttles, 2s. 6d. A set of Kitchen Utensils for cottage, 23s. Slack's Cutlery has been celebrated for 50 years. Ivory Table Knives, 14s., 16s., and 18s. per dozen. White Bone Knives and Forks, 8s. 9d. and 12s.; Black Horn ditto, 8s. and 10s. All warranted.

As the limits of an advertisement will not allow of a detailed list, purchasers are requested to send for their Catalogue, with 350 drawings, and prices of Electro Plate, Warranted Table Cutlery, Furnishing Ironmongery, &c. May be had gratis or post free. Every article marked in plain figures at the same low prices for which their establishment has been celebrated for nearly 50 years. Orders above £2 delivered carriage free per rail.

RICHARD AND JOHN SLACK, 336, STRAND, LONDON,

Opposite Somerset House.

TO SOLICITORS, &c., requiring DEED BOXES,

will find the best-made article lower than any other house. Lists of Prices and sizes may be had gratis or sent post free.

RICHARD AND JOHN SLACK, 336, Strand, opposite Somerset House. Established nearly 50 years. Orders above £2 sent carriage free.

NOTICE TO FAMILIES.—Messrs. TAYLOR beg

to submit their list of prices for the best articles. Cheese of the finest quality, per lb., viz., American, 6d. to 7½d.; Cheshire, 7½d. to 9d.; Cheddar, 7½d. to 9d.; Rippe Stilton, 1s.; Gruyere, 9d.; Parmesan, 1s. 4d. Wiltshire Bacon (by the side or half) 8½d. Best Salt Butter, 10d. to 1s. 2d.; fresh ditto, 1s. 4d. to 1s. 6d. York Hams, 6½d. to 8d.; choice ditto, from 8½d. to 20½d.; 9d. Ox Tongues, 3s. to 3s. 6d. each; young Fowls, 2s. to 2s. 6d. Large Capons, 2s.—W. and J. C. Taylor, 35, Little Pulteney-street, Golden-square, W.

Families waited upon for orders daily.

CHEDDAR LOAF CHEESE, 6½d., 7½d.; Fine

ditto, 8½d. per lb.; ripe Stilton, 1s. per lb.; Spanish and Westphalia Hams, 7½d. and 8½d. per lb.; prime Ox Tongues, 2s. 3d. each, or three for 6s. 6d.; snow-cured Spanish ditto, in packages of three for 7s. Osborne's peat-smoked Breakfast Bacon is now in excellent cure, and Butters in perfection, at reasonable rates. Other first-class provisions equally moderate. Packages gratis. OSBORNE'S Cheese Warehouse, Osborne House, 30, Ludgate-hill, near St. Paul's, E.C.

HAIR DYE! HAIR DYE! HAIR DYE!—

GILLINGWATER'S ATRAPILARY is the best Hair Dye in England. Grey, red, or rusty hair dyed instantly to beautiful and natural brown or black without the least injury to hair or skin, and the ill effects of bad dyes remedied.—Sold at all Chemists and Perfumers of repute, and by the proprietor, W. GILLINGWATER, 96, Goswell-road, and at his agent's 148, Holborn-bars. Sent free by any railway station in the kingdom in cases, 3s. 6d. 5s. 6d., and 10s. 6d. each.

BLAIR'S GOUT AND RHEUMATIC PILLS.

Price 1s. 1½d. and 2s. 9d. per box.

THIS preparation is one of the benefits which the

science of modern chemistry has conferred upon mankind; for during the first twenty years of the present century to speak of a cure for the Gout was considered a romance; but now the efficacy and safety of this medicine is so fully demonstrated, by unselected testimonials from persons in every rank of life, that public opinion proclaims this as one of the most important discoveries of the present age.

These Pills require no restraint of diet or confinement during their use and are certain to prevent the disease attacking any vital part.

Sold by all medicine vendors. Observe "Thomas Frost, 229, Strand London," on the Government Stamp.

is

d

a

it-
ualg's.
d.
0
0
0
0
0

or-

E-

ior
ent
ind
ys,
ia,
en-
rs.
res
ar-r-
nd
n-
ain
en
res

S,

sts

se.

eg
he
d.i
id.
to
ce
ng
le

ne

it-
ce
ia,
nd
ns
e,

in

rat
sta
nd
s's
in.

e

or
re
ly
m
of

e

A